


GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
DEPARTMENT OF ARCHAEOLOGY
CENTRAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL
LIBRARY

CALL No. 891.05 / J.A.O.S
ACC. No. 24540

D.G.A. 79.
GIPN—S1—2D. G. Arch.N. D./57—27-9-58—1,00,000

8.
9.
4/11/07





JOURNAL

OF THE

AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY.

EDITED BY

24540

E. WASHBURN HOPKINS, AND CHARLES C. TORREY

Professor in Yale University,
New Haven.

Professor in Yale University,
New Haven.

891.05
J. A. O. S.

TWENTY-EIGHTH VOLUME.

FIRST HALF.

A330

THE AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY,
NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT, U. S. A.

MCMVII

A copy of this volume, postage paid, may be obtained anywhere within the limits of the Universal Postal Union, by sending a Postal Order for two dollars and fifty cents, or its equivalent, to The American Oriental Society, New Haven, Connecticut, United States of America.

According to the conversion-tables used in the United States money-order system as the basis of international money-orders, two dollars and fifty cents (\$2.50) = 10 shillings and 3 pence = 10 marks and 30 pfennigs = 12 francs or lire and 70 centimes = 9 kroner and 25 öre = 6 florins and 9 cents Netherlandish.

[This half-volume is for January-June, 1907. Issued Sept. 12, 1907, in an edition of 500 copies.]

Copyright, 1907, by
THE AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY.

CENTRAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL
LIBRARY, NEW DELHI.

Acc. No..... 24540
Date..... 20.10.56
Call No..... 89405 / JAOS.


CONTENTS

OF

TWENTY-EIGHTH VOLUME,

FIRST HALF.

| | Page |
|--|------|
| THE HETERODOXIES OF THE SHIITES IN THE PRESENTATION OF IBN HAZM.—By ISRAEL FRIEDLAENDER, Professor in the Jewish Theological Seminary, New York City | 1 |
| CONTRIBUTIONS FROM THE JAIMINIYA BRAHMĀNA TO THE HISTORY OF THE BRAHMĀNA LITERATURE.—By HANNS OERTEL, Professor in Yale University, New Haven, Conn. | 81 |
| XENOPHON'S ACCOUNT OF THE FALL OF NINEVEH.—By PAUL HAUPT, Professor in the Johns Hopkins University, Balti- more, Md. | 99 |
| THE ETYMOLOGY OF CABINET.—By PAUL HAUPT, Professor in the Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. | 108 |
| THE NAME ISTAR.—By PAUL HAUPT, Professor in the Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. | 112 |
| THE SNIFF-KISS IN ANCIENT INDIA.—By E. WASHBURN HOPKINS, Professor in Yale University, New Haven, Conn. | 120 |
| THE ORIGIN AND REAL NAME OF NIN-IB.—By ALBERT T. CLAY, Assistant Professor in the University of Pennsylvania | 135 |
| AN EARLY BABYLONIAN TABLET OF WARNINGS FOR THE KING.— By STEPHEN LANGDON, Ph.D. | 145 |
| ROAD NOTES FROM CILICIA AND NORTH SYRIA.—By MR. J. RENWICK METHENY, the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. | 155 |
| REPORT ON AN ARAMAIC BOUNDARY INSCRIPTION IN CILICIA.—By JAMES A. MONTGOMERY, Ph.D., Professor in the Philadelphia Divinity School | 164 |
| A HYMN TO NERGAL.—By J. DYNELEY PRINCE, Professor in Colum- bia University, New York City | 168 |
| SOME PERSIAN REFERENCES TO ZOROASTER AND HIS RELIGION.—By Dr. ABRAHAM YOHANNAN and Professor A. V. WILLIAMS JACK- SON, of Columbia University, New York City | 183 |
| MOHAMMED 'ABDU, LATE MUFTI OF EGYPT.—By RICHARD GOTTHEIL, Professor in Columbia University, New York City | 189 |



JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY.

The Heterodoxies of the Shiites in the Presentation of Ibn Hazm.—By ISRAEL FRIEDLAENDER, Professor in the Jewish Theological Seminary, New York City.

INTRODUCTION.

"BECAUSE of thee"—with these words Muhammed is reported to have addressed once his nephew and son-in-law Ali—"because of thee two parties will come to ruin: thy overzealous admirers and thy passionate haters."¹ In this short sentence, put into the mouth of the Prophet by a retrospective consideration of history, is clearly indicated the main source of the decomposition of Islam in the past and present. For endless woe has been inflicted upon the professors of Islam by Ali and his descendants, the Alids. In the first battle, in which, betraying the principle of "jihâd," Muhammedans fought against Muhammedans, it was the name of Ali that served as the war-cry, and his name is still the watchword which splits the Muhammadan world into two hostile fractions. Streams of blood and, what is perhaps more important, streams of ink, representing the mental energy of the best and noblest in Islam, were shed to defend or to reject the claims of the Alids. But their claims are not yet settled, the minds by no means pacified, and the cry of revenge "Hasan! Husein!" sounds with undiminished violence through the lands of the Shi'a, arousing hatred and enmity in the hearts of its believers.²

¹ Shahrastâni, ed. Cureton, i, p. 15.

² On the Shiitic Muharram festival see Dozy, *Essai sur l'histoire de l'Islamisme*, p. 449 sq. An extremely graphic description of an eye-witness may be found in Horn, *Geschichte der persischen Litteratur*, 1901, p. 209 sq.

But more, perhaps, than to the outward destinies of Islam has the influence of Ali and the Alids proved pernicious to its inner development. With no merit, nay, with no intention on their part, but merely as the result of a tragic constellation of historical events, did the ill-fated Alids become the figure-heads of certain movements within Islam which ultimately aimed at undermining its foundations and giving it an entirely new appearance. For Islam, represented by the Arabs, had subjugated not only countries and nations, but also religions and cultures. The non-Arabic races of the conquered countries who mostly for political reasons—to get the full measure of the benefits equally accorded by Islam to all its adherents—became converts to the new faith, could hardly find their spiritual satisfaction in a religion which was so entirely different from their own and in many respects decidedly inferior to it. Their disappointment in finding their religious demands unsatisfied must have been as keen as their disappointment in finding that their hopes for political equality were unfulfilled. No wonder then that under the guise of the new faith these converts persistently clung to their old beliefs and even endeavored to smuggle into Islam some of their most cherished ideas which were essentially un-Islamic and for the most part even anti-Islamic. The result of these endeavors was the formation of a large number of sects with a peculiar, often grotesque mixture of extremely heterogeneous elements. The Caliphs as the official heads of orthodox Islam were no less hateful to these non-Arabic sectarians than they were to them in their capacity as representatives of the Arabic political supremacy. Under these circumstances the "House of the Prophet"—as Ali and his descendants were commonly called—which itself had been wronged, or had been considered wronged, by the ruling powers, became the natural center of all dissatisfaction—economic, political, religious—that had been rapidly accumulating in Islam after its glorious inception. The heterodox sects which arose in the first century of the Hijra, in themselves a violent, though veiled, protest against victorious Islam, were thus driven towards Shiism, i. e. towards Ali and his dynasty as the representatives of the opposition; with the result, not less tragic than paradoxical, that the "House of the Prophet," which derived its claim exclusively from its connection with the founder of Islam, was chiefly instrumental in destroying or disfiguring his life-work.

This remarkable process, which under the name of "Shiism" has powerfully influenced the destinies of Islam, is known to us but in the roughest outlines. The political tendencies in early Islam are becoming more and more transparent, owing to recent important investigations in this field. We are now able clearly to pursue the rise and development of political parties within Islam and the manifold tendencies that were working under the surface. As far as the *political* aspect of Shiism is concerned, it fully participates in the increase of our knowledge of Muhammedan history. But we have a very imperfect notion of the rise and development of the *religious* tendencies in Shiism and the sources from which they were derived.¹

¹ The origin of Shiism is still a problem which is as little settled, or perhaps less settled, than it was scores of years ago. Formerly the influence of Persian ideas on the rise of the Shi'a was advocated as a matter of course by men like Kremer, Dozy, August Müller, and recently (although in contradiction with his sound remarks in the introduction) by Blochet (*le Messianisme dans l'hétérodoxie Musulmane*, Paris 1908). This assumption is apparently based on two arguments: (1) on the adherence of modern Persia to Shiism, and (2) on the resemblance between the doctrine of incarnation taught by Shiism and a similar conception current in Central Asia (cf. Kremer, *Geschichte der herrschenden Ideen des Islams*, pp. 14, 361, 377). But the former argument is refuted by the fact that as late as 1500 A.D. Persia was in great part Sunnite (Nöldeke, *Sketches from Eastern History*, p. 101). As for the latter argument, one does not see why the doctrine of incarnation should not rather be attributed, as was already suggested by the great Ibn Khaldūn and even earlier Muhammedan writers, to the influence of Christianity. Wellhausen (*Die religiös-politischen Oppositionsparteien im alten Islam*, Berlin 1901, p. 91) pointed to a certain heterodox doctrine of Judaism as the probable source of Shiism. But his view is based upon the report of Tabarī, which essentially contradicts that of Shahrastānī and similar writers (contrary to note 1 on p. 91) and deserves as little credit as the information of Tabarī about the political rôle of the founders of Shiism disproved by Wellhausen himself (in his *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, vi, p. 124). Again, van Vloten, as already de Sacy, laid, among other things, great stress on the Messianic tendencies in early Islam as the main source of Shiism (see van Vloten, *Recherches sur la domination arabe, le Chiitisme et les croyances messianiques sous le Khalifat des Omayades*, Amsterdam, 1894, p. 54 sq. and de Sacy, *Exposé de la religion des Druses*, I. xxxi sq.). But they both erred in putting too much confidence in the accounts of the Arabic writers on 'Abdallah ibn Sabā, the enigmatic founder of Shiism,—accounts which can be easily proved to be apocryphal (see the index to this treatise, s.v. 'Abdallah ibn Sabā).

Nearly three score and ten years have passed since Silvestre de Sacy, the originator of modern Arabic scholarship, attempted to give a systematic presentation of Shiism in the introductory chapters of his *Exposé de la religion des Druses* (two volumes, 1838). Almost a whole literature has since been rescued from oblivion and access has been given to historical sources then scarcely dreamt of. Yet a pragmatic history of Shiism which would reveal to us the inner workings and the organic development of this movement is still a desideratum, and will probably remain a desideratum for a long time to come. This peculiar condition is by no means due to a lack of zeal on the part of modern Arabists. It can and must be primarily attributed to a twofold circumstance: to the nature of the problem itself, and to the character of the historical material dealing with it.

One of the main obstacles that prevent a proper understanding of the Shiitic movement lies in the nature of the problem, i. e. in the extremely heterogeneous character of its constituent elements. Possibly the rise, but certainly the development of Shiism took place in 'Irāk, in the province of ancient Babylon shortly before wrested from the Persians, in a country where, as perhaps in no other, different and even conflicting civilizations succeeded and penetrated one another. For thousands of years 'Irāk had been saturated with the overwhelming Babylonian culture which, though in other forms and through other channels, as, e. g., the movement of Mani or the peculiar sect of the Mandaeans, exerted its influence centuries after it had disappeared from the surface. It passed through the hands of the Seleucids and was for nearly eight centuries the seat of the powerful civilization of Iran as represented by the Arsacids and Sassanids. It sheltered for a long period a large Christian population which took an active, if not a leading, part in the spiritual life of the country, serving as a medium not only for

The writer himself ventured to suggest (in his inaugural lecture on "Die Messiasidee im Islam." printed in *Festschrift zum siebzigsten Geburtstage A. Berliner's*, Frankfurt a. M., 1908, pp. 116-130) as the germ of Shiism a combination of the Jewish belief in the advent of the Messiah with the Christian heterodox doctrine of Docetism, so widely spread in early Islam. This is not the place to enter into details. But the variety of suggestions undoubtedly proves the uncertainty still besetting this fundamental question of Shiism.

the doctrines of Christianity, but also for various phases of Greek thought. 'Irāk was for many centuries the numerical and spiritual center of the Jewish nation, and on its soil Talmudic Judaism grew up and matured as a leading force in Jewish life. All these so very heterogeneous influences came to bear upon young Islam, and the latter, unsettled as yet, was not able to resist this manifold pressure. Since the bearers of these cultures were the non-Arabic races, and the latter, deceived in their political expectations, joined the political opposition, these new influences also came to be associated with this opposition, i. e. Shiism, and the foreign elements in consequence found their first and foremost representatives in the sects of the Shiites. In order therefore to gain a clear conception of the elements of Shiism and of its subsequent development amidst foreign cultures, it will first be necessary to gain a clear conception of these foreign cultures themselves and of their condition at the time when they came in contact with Islam; a difficult and complicated task which practically lies beyond the province of Muhammedan historiography.

Another equally important drawback is to be found in the character of the historical material dealing with Shiism. The main source of our knowledge of Shiitic as well as Muhammedan sects in general are the numerous books on "Religions and Sects," mostly belonging to the third and fourth century of the Hijra, of which the book of Shahrastānī is the chief and best known specimen. We certainly owe a debt of gratitude and admiration to the authors of this "*Milal wa'n-Nihāl*" literature; doubly so when we remember that they were orthodox Muhammedans who firmly believed themselves to be the sole possessors of divine truth and consequently must have considered it a mere luxury to describe and refute doctrines branded beforehand as falsehoods and heresies. At the same time we must not forget that it is the very same belief which greatly detracts from the value of their historical endeavors. The certitude with which they regarded their opponents as a host of heretics who had forfeited their salvation and deserved physical and spiritual extermination, was by no means conducive to historical objectiveness. It was, on the contrary, likely to have the reverse effect in inducing them to ascribe to these heretics tenets which they never held, and to give to the tenets actually

held by them such interpretations as would disgust and deter the orthodox reader.

This difficulty is seriously aggravated by another circumstance which has had disastrous consequences for the whole field of Muhammedan history of religion. Owing to a linguistic misunderstanding of an old tradition,¹ probably also under the influence of astrological ideas,² the Prophet was credited with a saying according to which Islam will be divided into 73 sects, of which 72 will be doomed and only a single one will be saved. This *hadith* received its final shape in a comparatively late age. For the well-known traveller Mukaddasi (wrote about 373/985), who displays so vivid an interest in all matters theological, is still acquainted with another more tolerant, but to the Muhammedans, so jealous of their Paradise, extremely painful form of the *hadith*, according to which only a single sect will be doomed, while the remaining 72 will be saved.³ However this may be, the fact remains that the former less tolerant variant gained the victory and "this *hadith*, which, with very slight variations, soon came to be generally known, formed the basis of the history of religions and sects in Muhammedan literature."⁴ Muhammedan writers on dogmatic history start from this *hadith* as an indisputable fact and make convulsive endeavors to squeeze out the required number. As early a historian as Mas'ūdī (died 345/956) considers himself bound by this *hadith*.⁵ 'Abd al-Kāhir al-Baghdādī (died 429/1038), the author of a comprehensive description of Muhammedan sects,⁶ presents in the introduction to his book an itemized, almost businesslike, account of the 73 sects. Shahrazānī (died 545/1153) bases upon this *hadith* his account of Muhammedan as well as Jewish, Christian and Zoroastrian sects. The same

¹ Goldziher, "Beiträge zur Litteraturgeschichte der Schia," in *Sitzungsberichte der philos.-histor. Classe der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Wien*, vol. 78 (1874), p. 445. The same writer in his article "le dénombrement des sectes Mohametanes" in *Revue de l'histoire des Religions*, vol. 26 (1892), p. 129 sq.

² See Steinschneider, "Die kanonische Zahl der muhammedanischen Secten" in *ZDMG*. iv, p. 145 sq.

³ Mukaddasi, ed. de Goeje, p. 39. Fakhr ad-Din ar-Rāzī, died 606^b, is still acquainted with this variant, Goldziher, *le dénombrement*, etc., p. 182.

⁴ Goldziher, *ibid.*, p. 181.

⁵ *Murūj ad-Dahab*, v, 475.

⁶ See later, p. 26 sq.

holds good in the case of other contemporaneous historians. Later writers go even further. The principle “*ikhtilaf al-ummati rahmatun*”—“the difference of opinion in the community (of Islam) is an act of (Divine) mercy”—which was laid down to serve as an extenuating circumstance for the existence of different-legalistic sects in Islam, was, of course, not extended to the heterodox sects. Here, on the contrary, the differences and contradictions had to be regarded as a sign of warning, indicating the perilous nature of these sects. The more numerous and the more contradictory these differences appeared, the more likely was the faithful Muslim to be deterred from any connivance to their heresies. Later writers yield to this tendency and, in consequence, widely exceed the number of 72, claimed by the saying of the Prophet for the heterodox sects. To satisfy their religious conscience, these writers interpret this number as representing the *principal* non-orthodox sects and, thus freed from the restraint of tradition, enumerate such a motley multitude of sects and sections that the “*ahl as-Sunna wa'l-jam'a*” cannot help recognizing the enormous superiority of their own firmly established creed over the fluctuating falsehoods of their opponents. Makrizi's account of heterodox sects¹ may be taken as a typical specimen of this artificial enumeration of sects. “The Rawāfiḍ (or Shiites), says Makrizi (died 845/1442) who largely draws from old sources, number *three hundred* sects, of which twenty are well-known.”² “The Khaṭṭābiyya (a small faction of the Shi'a) are divided into *fifty* sects.”³ Many other examples of this kind can easily be quoted.

This tendency toward multiplying the number of heterodox sects is unhappily strengthened by a peculiar feature of the Arabic language, I mean the pliability of the *nisba* ending. For by far more readily than any modern language with its borrowed “isms” is the Arabic language able to handle its ending “*iyya*,” appending it with wonderful ease not only to all kinds of nouns, either designating things, or persons, countries and the like, but practically to every part of speech. This linguistic contrivance enables the theologians to manufac-

¹ Cf. Goldziher, *Zahiriten*, p. 94 sq.

² *Khitāt*, ii, p. 344 sq. ³ *Ibid.*, p. 351. ⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 352.

ture any number of sects required for special purposes. Their descriptions, in consequence, offer an artificial system of names which for the most part lack all historical significance, being nothing but variations of real names, and the identification of the sects thus becomes a matter of utmost difficulty.¹

Before we shall be able to get at the historical kernel and disentangle it from the chaos piled up around it by pious mendacity, the compulsion of a religious tradition and the deceptive use of a pliable language, a long series of preliminary investigations will have to be undertaken and concluded. As for Shiism in particular, the first thing to be done will be to make accessible all the available material bearing on this important section of Islam. This new material, together with that already known, should then be carefully sifted and their respective data critically weighed against each other. The results thus arrived at, presenting, as they would, the actual, not the imaginary, tenets of the Shiites, ought to be compared with and verified by what we know of the cultures that might be thought of as the possible sources of these tenets. Only then, when this preliminary work will have been done, shall we be able to attain to what is nothing perhaps in the eyes of Muhammedan theolo-

¹ A few examples will suffice to illustrate the assertions made in the text. They can be multiplied ad libitum. A part of the Keisāniyya believed in the "badā" (see the index to this treatise s.h.v.). In consequence a special sect of Badā'iyya figures in İji's *Mawdūkif* (p. 348). Some of the Shiites held the belief in the advent of the Mahdi (raj'a) or in the transmigration of souls (tanāsukh). Makrīzī therefore records two new sects: the Raj'iyya and Tanāsukhiyya (*Khīṭat* ii, 854). The followers of Muhammed b. Nu'mān with the nickname Shaitān at-Tāk are called the Nu'māniyya or Shaitāniyya (see index s.h.v.). But it would not appear in any way strange, were this sect to be designated as the Muhammadiyya (after his first name), the Ja'fariyya (after his kunya Abū Ja'far), al-Āḥwaliyya (after his by-name, al-Āḥwal), or were this sect to derive its name from the Mahdis worshipped or the tenets professed by it. It will be seen in the course of this treatise, to what extent the recognition of the actual relations between Shiitic sects is hampered by this artificial variety of names. It may be mentioned in this connection that the same tendency with the same disastrous results prevails in Makrīzī's account on the sects of Judaism (*Khīṭat*, ii, 476–480). —Dozy (*Essai sur l'histoire de l'Islamisme*, p. 197) and Kremer (*Culturgeschichte* ii, 400) have already pointed to the pernicious effect of the ḥadīth in the number of sects.

gians, but is everything to us : a history of the *development* of Shiism in connection with the history of Muhammedan culture.

In this light, as a contribution towards the building material for a pragmatic history of the Shi'a, this treatise is herewith presented, centering, as it does, around an account on Shiitic sects by an Arabic writer who preceded Shahrastānī by a full century.

This account, however, considerably increases in value and interest when we think of the man from whose pen it came. For 'Ali b. Alīmed *ibn Ḥazm* is one of those sharply marked individualities who are so exceedingly rare in *ijmā'*-ridden Islam, despite its enormous store of mental energy. Ibn Ḥazm was not a pet of destiny. His greatness was neither recognized by his jealous contemporaries nor duly appreciated by a narrow-minded posterity. But should the mental products of Ibn Ḥazm be rescued from the oblivion to which fanatical zeal and unreasonable neglect had doomed them, he will be acknowledged not only as the unrivalled representative of literary Spain, but as one of the greatest men in the whole dominion of Islam.

'Alī b. Alīmad b. Sa'īd b. Ḥazm b. Ḡālib b. Sālih¹ Abū Muhammed was born in Cordova in the year 384/994, as the son of Alīmad b. Sa'īd, who occupied a prominent official position under the famous Almansor and his successor. Ibn Ḥazm's early life thus coincided with the most stirring period in the history of Muhammedan Spain, when the mighty edifice of the Omeyyad caliphate began to totter and in a series of terrible shocks broke up into a number of petty states. Owing to the position occupied by his father, Ibn Ḥazm could not and would not stand aside, but took an immediate and prominent part in the political vicissitudes of his country. It was however a fortunate circumstance for him, and still more so for Arabic literature, that the constellation of events put an early end to his political career and, as it were, by force made of the brilliant statesman a brilliant scholar.

¹ This genealogy is recorded by al-Kiftī, see *Catalogus Codicum Arabicorum Bibliothecae Academiae Lugduno-Batavae*, i (1888), p. 269. A short biography of Ibn Ḥazm is given by Wüstenfeld, *Geschichtschreiber der Araber*, No. 202, and by Brockelmann, *Geschichte der arabischen Litteratur*, i, 400. But some of their statements are erroneous, at least misleading, as can easily be seen from a comparison of their data with those given above. The sources for Ibn Ḥazm's biography are quoted by Brockelmann.

The ancestors of Ibn Ḥazm appear to have been Christians who lived in the district of Niebla. His great-grandfather Ḥazm is said to have been converted to the faith of Islam.¹ But this origin apparently possessed little attraction for a member of the Moorish aristocracy who was besides a passionate hater of Christianity. He was therefore anxious to improve his pedigree and followed the example of his father, who, being an Omeyyad official, shrewdly claimed as his progenitor a certain Persian who enjoyed the clientship of Yazid, a brother of Mu'āwiya, the founder of the Omeyyad dynasty.² Whether this claim was the cause or the effect, Ibn Ḥazm at any rate always remained an ardent partisan of the Omeyyads, and in the terrible struggle that was raging around this dynasty gallantly fought and staunchly suffered in their behalf. In 1013, when the Berbers captured Cordova and gave full vent to their wild passions, Ibn Ḥazm's beautiful palace in Balāṭ Muğīth, the eastern suburb of Cordova,³ fell a prey to the flames.⁴ In 1016 Kheirān, the leader of the Slavs, having raised the Berber 'Alī b. Hammūd to the throne, sent Ibn Ḥazm to prison for his allegiance to the Omeyyad cause, and later banished him to Azna'l-Kazar, near Séville.⁵ Again in 1018, when the unscrupulous Kheirān, who had become tired of the independent Hammudite, proclaimed 'Abdarrahmān IV. al-Murtadha calif in Valencia, Ibn Ḥazm hastened to join the Omeyyad prince, and bravely fought on his side against the Berbers. 'Abdarrahmān, betrayed by Kheirān, was defeated and slain and his partisan Ibn Ḥazm was captured by the victorious Berbers and kept in prison for some length of time. Once more was Ibn Ḥazm's star to rise, but only to disappear speedily and forever. By a desperate effort the Cordovans succeeded in ridding themselves of their Berber oppressors, and on December 1, 1023, 'Abdarrahmān V., al-Mustāz̄hir, son of the murdered 'Abdarrahmān IV, was proclaimed by a plebiscit in the Mosque Caliph of Spain. Ibn Ḥazm was soon near his youthful sovereign, who was also his friend, and was at once raised by him to the dignity of vizier. But in less than seven weeks 'Abdarrahmān was

¹ Dozy, *Geschichte der Mauren in Spanien* (1874), ii, 210.

² *Ibidem.*

³ Catalogue, Leyden, i, 267.

⁴ Dozy, *ib.* p. 190.

⁵ Catal., p. 268.

attacked and slain by the treacherous mob of Cordova and Ibn Hazm was once more taken prisoner.¹ When at last released, he was unable to find a resting-place for himself. The hatred of narrow-minded theologians pursued him wherever he went and the rulers of the various states were induced by his enemies to refuse him their hospitality. Finally he settled on his estate Mant Lishām, near Labla, and there spent the rest of his life. Cured of his political ambitions, he devoted himself exclusively to literary activity, surrounded by a number of young students, who were courageous enough to seek the company of the unpopular and generally persecuted man.² He died in the solitude of his estate in the year 456/1064.

The leisure thus forced upon Ibn Hazm by adverse political circumstances was utilized by him to its utmost limits. Ibn Hazm became an author of that stupendous productivity which we find so characteristically represented in Arabic literature. The Arabic bibliographers who measure a man's greatness by the size and weight of his wastepaper basket faithfully report that Ibn Hazm's works amounted to "a camel's load," and we are reliably told on the authority of his son that their number reached the formidable sum of four hundred.³ To be sure, Arabic bibliography, as bibliography in general, is more concerned with the title-page of a literary work than with its contents, and is prone to confer the honorific title of a book where one would rather speak of a pamphlet or even a circular. Yet with all these limitations, Ibn Hazm's productivity lays claim to our unreserved admiration.

We must, however, be careful not to become prejudiced against Ibn Hazm's writings because of their quantity. We would do the man gross injustice, were we to put him on the same plane with some of the Arabic polygraphs, those living writing-machines whose activity is more a matter of perseverance than of ability. On the contrary, the trait that strikes one in Ibn Hazm first is his originality and its outward complement, brilliancy. It is this originality, coupled with truthfulness and fearlessness, which stamps Ibn Hazm as a really great man. His originality is perhaps best testified by the fact that, though he

¹ Dozy, *ib.* p. 205 sq.

² Catalogue Leyden (first edition), i, 230.

³ *Ibidem.*

himself was more orthodox than the orthodox, his writings were accorded the honor of a public auto-da-fé in his lifetime¹ and were pursued by prohibitions long after his death.² The light in which posterity judged this originality is strikingly illustrated by the protest of the famous mystic Ibn 'Arabi (died 634/1240), who emphatically denies to be one of those who constantly repeat: "Thus saith Ibn Hazm."³ As to the brilliancy of his style, it is charmingly displayed in the graceful description of his early love, which won for him the distinction, conferred upon him by the best judge of Moorish culture, himself a brilliant writer, of being the most thoughtful poet of Spain,⁴ and it manifests itself with equal power in the violent sarcasm of his polemics, which originated the later phrase designating the tongue of Ibn Hazm as a twin-brother of the bloody sword of the famous general Hajjāj b. Yūsuf.⁵

One of the chief products of Ibn Hazm's literary activity is the work to which this treatise is mainly devoted: his "*Kitāb al-Milāl wa'n-Nihāl*," the "Book on Religions and Sects."⁶ The originality of his mind shows itself in the very design of the book, which is the first attempt—termed "genius-like" by the foremost authority on the religion of Islam⁷—to extend the legalistic system of the Zahirite school over the whole field of Muhammedan dogmatics. As for the brilliancy of his style, it is perhaps nowhere shown to better advantage than in the chapters directed against Judaism and Christianity, which are an inimitable specimen of the Arabic art of "mujādala," and, despite the abusive and sometimes even vulgar language, are a delightful example of Arabic scientific prose.

This work moreover bears witness to other qualities of Ibn Hazm which mark him as the most eminent historian of religion in Arabic literature and attach to his information exceptional value and importance. One is struck at the outset with the

¹ *Ib.* 230, 234.

² Hāfi Chalifa vi, 115.—Ibn Chaldūn, *Mukaddima*, ed. Quatremère, i, p. 4.

³ ZDMG. 52, 516.

⁴ Dozy, *Geschichte*, p. 211.

⁵ Ibn Khalikān, s.v.

⁶ On the variations in the title of the book see my article "Zur Komposition von Ibn Hazm's Milāl wa'n-Nihāl" in *Orientalische Studien*, i, (1896), p. 267, n. 1.

⁷ Goldziher, *Zahiriten*, p. 186.

wide outlook of the author, which comprises within its compass not only the whole of the Muhammedan world, but extends a vast deal beyond it. It is not mere boasting on his part when he occasionally remarks:¹ "We have come in contact with, and received information from, people of distant countries, and have always been anxious to enquire into things that were unknown to us. We have had at our disposal numerous historical works containing the records of many nations, both Arabs and non-Arabs. We have also received information about the kingdoms of the Christians, as far as the country of Rûm (Byzantium), also about the kingdoms of the Slavs,² Turks, Hindus and Negros, both of ancient and modern times." The work, written at the height of Moorish culture, displays that broad universalistic spirit by which nothing human is deemed foreign, and his arraignment of Judaism and Christianity reveals an intimate knowledge of other religions which is quite unique during the middle ages and very rare even in modern days. But though a scholar of vast erudition, Ibn Hazm was by no means a book-worm. Ibn Hazm learned from men as much as, or even more than, he learned from books. A vizier, the son of a vizier, he was in early life involved in the vicissitudes of a stirring revolutionary period. He saw a good deal of the world and came in contact with all sorts and conditions of men, turning this living experience into excellent account in his literary work. This breath of life is the most refreshing and at the same time the most valuable feature of Ibn Hazm's standard work. He enjoyed the personal acquaintance not only of representatives of various shades of Muhammedan thought and dogma, but also of the foremost champions of the two other religions of Spain, of Judaism and Christianity. When still in Cordova at the age of twenty, he discussed Biblical passages with the famous Jewish statesman and scholar Joseph ibn Nagdela,³ and the Bishop⁴ as well as the Dayyân⁵ of Cordova, were counted among his friends. References to Christian and more so to Jewish contemporaries are very fre-

¹ *Milal wa'n-Nihâl*, ed. Cairo, i, 175.

² The Vienna manuscript adds "Khazars."

³ *M. wa'n-N.*, i, 152 and 135.

⁴ *Ib.* ii, 108.

⁵ *M. wa'n-N.*, codex Vienna, fol. 100^b.

quent in his book,¹ and, while adding considerable weight to his information, they also bear splendid evidence as to Ibn Hazm's many-sidedness and thirst for knowledge.

Another striking trait of Ibn Hazm's personality as displayed in this book is his critical acumen and his keen power of observation. Ibn Hazm keeps an open eye on the world around him and perceives things, and details of things, which would escape a less keen observer. His statements are never blurred, but always definite and admirably accurate. Though a thinker of no mean order, he never seeks refuge in ambiguous abstractions but always carries the analysis of things down to their minute details. Many an interesting specimen of this thoroughness can be found in the *Milal wa'n-Nihāl*. Discussing the passage Matthew xiii, 31-32, he polemically remarks that the author must have been completely ignorant of agriculture. "We saw the mustard plant ourselves, we also knew others who had seen it in distant countries. Yet we never saw nor were we told by those who had seen anything of the plant that a bird could dwell on it."² Referring to a wide-spread Jewish legend³ which told of a Jewish sage of Bagdad who miraculously came over to Cordova⁴ to punish a certain Abū Muhammed Ibn Iskenderānī for having oppressed the Jews of the latter city, he at once plunges into a description of the man and his family and the place where they lived, so as to prove the absurdity of the legend and the mendacity of the Jews. His lucid and scholarly expositions on chronological, geographical and similar complicated questions of Biblical criticism bear witness to the same effect.⁵

But the characteristic which constitutes the real greatness of Ibn Hazm and is of paramount importance for the subject dealt with in this treatise is his truthfulness. "With reference to the dogmas (of the Shiites), Abū Muhammed Ibn Hazm's *Kitāb al-Milal wa'n-Nihāl*—a work, I am sorry to say, not yet sufficiently studied, but in every respect worthy of further propagation and

¹ Cmp. Goldziher in *Kobak's Yeshurun* viii (1872), p. 76 sq. and Hirshfeld in *Jewish Quarterly Review* xiii (1901), p. 222 sq.

² *M. wa'n-N.*; ii, 34.

³ *Ib.* i, 156.

⁴ The Edition (i. 156, l. 2) has قرطبة which may only be a misprint. The manuscripts of Leyden and Vienna have the correct reading.

⁵ Cmp. his lengthy discussion of the number of the Jewish military recruits, i, 165 sq., or his geographical explanations, i, 166.

scrutiny—certainly is an excellent source. He, too, is polemical in the course of the whole work, and not without passion. Nevertheless he is of sufficient historical fidelity.”¹ Ibn Hazm’s truthfulness is of the right sort, being as anxious to say the truth as to avoid an untruth. He is always ready to call a spade a spade and to shower upon his opponents the inexhaustible stream of Arabic invectives. His attacks, e. g., on al-Ash‘ari, the patron-saint of orthodox Islam, whom he stigmatizes as an infidel, are of an incredibly violent nature, and they were probably the cause of the persecutions to which his writings were subjected. But at the same time Ibn Hazm is ready to do justice to people with different and even opposite opinions. In his attacks on Jews and Christians he is always anxious not to misjudge things, and he often quotes and carefully considers their counter-arguments. “We have already mentioned,” remarks Ibn Hazm in the course of his polemics, “that we shall not use against them any quotation from their Torah which is not clear in its meaning, since the opponent might reply by saying that the Lord meant by it anything he likes.”² In the same spirit he solemnly pledges himself, in the introduction to his treatise on the “depravities” of the extreme heterodox sects, a subject which invites misrepresentations, that he will never charge an opponent with a heterodox view unless he can justify it by a verbal quotation from the opponent’s own writings, “be he an unbeliever, a heretic or a mere sinner, since lying is not permissible against anybody.”³ This attitude raises Ibn Hazm far above the level of other Muhammedan writers on similar subjects and renders his statements singularly trustworthy.

Last, but certainly not least, Ibn Hazm’s report on the sects of Islam is of exceptional value because of its being, as far as we know, the only one which is not fettered by the tradition on the 73 sects. In consequence of his rigid conception of Muhammedan tradition,⁴ Ibn Hazm completely ignores this hadith, which is neither recorded by Bukhārī nor by Muslim, and no mention of it is made throughout the bulky work. The effect is at once evident in a more logical division of Muhammedan sects

¹ Goldziher, *Beiträge zur Litteraturgeschichte der Schi'a*, p. 443.

² *Milal*, i, 165.

³ *Milal*, iv, 178.

⁴ Cmp. Kremer, *herrschende Ideen*, p. 138 sq.

(see later) and in a considerably reduced number of sect names. We may safely assume that each name recorded in the *Milal wa'n-Nihâl* represents a historical fact and not, as in the case of all other writers, a mere product of imagination.

Having allotted so much space to the merits of Ibn Hazm's work, we would appear not quite unbiased were we to suppress all mention of its shortcomings. As early as in the fourteenth century a well-known Muhammedan theologian emphasized the superiority of Shahrastâni's book over that of Ibn Hazm on the ground that the latter was "scattered and without proper disposition."¹ Though the reproach expressed in these words loses much of its force when the history of the book is more closely considered, yet it must be admitted that this criticism strikingly characterizes the book of Ibn Hazm in distinction from that of Shahrastâni. Ibn Hazm with his agile mind and fiery temperament certainly did not possess the academic fishblood of the scholar and systematizer Shahrastâni. Ibn Hazm's *Milal wa'n-Nihâl*, particularly the sections dealt with in the present treatise, indisputably lack the systematic roundness and scientific classification, so conspicuous in the rival work. More especially the account on the Shiites is quite unmethodical and often very abrupt. But all these shortcomings fade into insignificance before the great characteristics of Ibn Hazm's personality: his breadth of outlook, his power of observation and, above all, his fairness of judgment.

The *Kitâb al-Milal wa'n-Nihâl* is not a work of a uniform and harmonious construction. Its composite nature can be easily traced and demonstrated. On another occasion² I endeavored to disclose the original plan of the book and the way it was carried out. Here it will suffice to state the results arrived at. Originally the *Milal wa'n-Nihâl* was conceived as a mainly dogmatic composition. The description of the religions and sects proper occupied but a fourth of the work, while the rest scrutinized the Muhammedan dogmas from the point of view of Zahirite doctrine. Subsequently, however, the author tried to do more justice to the title of the book by incorporating with it two large

¹ as-Subki, quoted by Hâji-Chalfa, vi, 116.

² In *Orientalische Studien*, 1906, published on the seventieth birthday of Prof. Nöldeke, pp. 267-277.

monographs written previously, one consisting of a polemical treatise directed against Judaism and Christianity, the other being an account of the tenets of the extreme heterodox sects of Islam.

Ibn Hazm's *Milal wa'n-Nihāl* is preserved in five manuscripts which may here be enumerated in chronological order: 1) A manuscript of the University Library of Leyden (henceforward designated as L) in two volumes, the first dated 722^h, the second 734^h.¹ 2) A codex in the British Museum (=Br) consisting of two volumes both written in 734^h.² 3) An incomplete manuscript of the Hofbibliothek in Vienna (=V) dated 1091^h.³ 4) A manuscript in Cairo of the year 1271^h (see later). 5) A manuscript in three volumes in the library of Yale University (=Y) written in 1298^h.⁴ The Cairo manuscript was recently reproduced in a printed edition (henceforward designated as Ed) which appeared in Cairo in five parts in 1317–1321^h. A glance at the various manuscripts reveals the existence of systematic divergencies between them which can only be explained as representing various stages in the composition of the book. Flügel,⁵ who only saw the Vienna manuscript, already observed that the words "Says Abū Muhammed," by which almost every paragraph of the book is introduced, point to the fact that the book was, from dictation or otherwise, written down and edited by a strange hand. This observation seems to gain support from the discrepancies in the dates mentioned in various sections of the book. Thus at the beginning of his work Ibn Hazm speaks of the reign of Hishām al-Mu'tadd (418–422^h)⁶ as being contemporaneous. On the other hand, at the end of his polemics against Judaism and Christianity he refers to the year 450^h and in a passage shortly before to 450 and odd years. Again in a later section of the book the year 440 is to be inferred as the date of composition.⁷ A more minute scrutiny discloses the fact

¹ Catalogue Leyden (1866), iv, 280 sq.

² Rieu, *Catalogus codicium manuscriptorum orientalium qui in Museo Britannico asservantur*, London 1871, ii, p. 726.

³ Flügel, *Catalogue Vienna* (1865), ii, No. 975.

⁴ See later, p. 24.

⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 198 Anm. 1.

⁶ *Milal*, i, p. 16. The Edition has المعتدلي. See Lane-Poole, *Muhammadan Dynasties* (1894), p. 21, and Maḳkari i, 191, note c, and 282, note c.

⁷ *Milal*, iv, 94, l. 2.

that the five manuscripts go back to two distinctly marked recensions. The exact relationship between these two recensions can, of course, be determined only by means of a careful collation which would include all manuscripts and extend over the whole book, a task which, in consideration of the size of the *Milal wa'n-Nihāl*, would demand an enormous amount of time and patience. Personally I have been able to collate all manuscripts extant (with the exception of the Cairo manuscript, which is reproduced in the printed edition) only for the portions translated in this treatise. I have also consulted the manuscripts of Leyden and Vienna for many a passage in the earlier part of the work, especially in the chapters bearing on Judaism and Christianity, occasionally also in the latter sections. These collations form the basis of the following observations, which, because of the fragmentary character of the former, do not in any way pretend to be exhaustive or definitive. The relationship between the various codes seems to differ in the different sections of the book. In the earlier part, the two oldest contemporaneous codices, L. and Br., belong to different categories, the latter forming one group with V., the former siding with Y. and Ed. The affinity between Br. and V. is here of so close a nature that it can be explained only by assigning a common original to both, or by regarding the one as the copy of the other. L. and Y. as well as Ed. go, as a rule, together. But they also show slight variations and in some important instances correspond with Br. and V. The latter part of the work presents quite a different aspect. Eliminating V., which is defective, we can see at a glance that L. and Br. on one hand and Y. and Ed. on the other present two sharply marked types. The resemblance between the manuscripts of each group is so striking that no doubt is left as to the identity of their respective originals.

The observations just offered necessarily remain fragmentary and uncertain, owing to the incompleteness of the evidence upon which they are based. A closer investigation will no doubt bring out more clearly the evidently complicated relations between the various manuscripts. One fact, however, must be noticed right here. In the chapter bearing on Shiism, which originally formed a part of a monograph on heterodox sects,

¹ *Zur Komposition, etc.*, p. 272 sq.

the differences between the two recensions are not mere variants, but frequently affect the contents to a considerable extent. The group consisting of L.-Br. offers many an additional reading which is of historical importance. Some variants directly contradict one another. It is therefore important to establish the relative age of the recensions. Happily there is one passage in the book which gives us an important hint in this direction. Speaking of the Mahdi of the Shiites, who was born about 260^b,¹ he slightly remarks: "And they (the Shiites) are still waiting for a lost object since 180 years."² L.-Br. read "180 and odd years." This group would thus appear to be later by a few years than the recension represented by Y. and Ed. It must however be admitted that in face of the divergencies in the dates in the various parts of the book, this evidence cannot be regarded as conclusive, and may perhaps be valid only for the latter part of the book, from which the passage under consideration is derived.

The texts published in translation in this treatise consist of four pieces derived from various sections of the *Milal wa'n-Nihāl*. The first piece is composed of Ibn Ḥazm's general account of the sects of Islam and serves as an introduction to his elaborate examination of the Muhammedan dogmas to which the book is in main devoted. This account is very brief, quite in accordance with its introductory character. It does not limit itself to the Shiites, but presents a brief survey of all Muhammedan sects. Since the description of Shiism is interwoven with that of other sects, the piece had to be given *in extenso*; a limitation to Shiism would have resulted in a motley number of fragmentary passages. The second piece in this treatise is represented by the chapter on Shiism taken from the originally independent monograph on the extreme heterodox sects, which is now incorporated with the *Milal wa'n-Nihāl*. The third piece gives an extract from the chapter on the Imāmate, as far as it has an immediate bearing on the tenets of Shiism. The fourth, and last, piece gives a brief synopsis of Shiism which is

¹ Or rather who was supposed to have been born. Ibn Ḥazm denies his existence altogether; see later, pp. 48 and 76. I take the date of his father's death. The officially recognized date of the Mahdi's birth is 255^b.

² *Milal*, iv, 94, l. 2.

extant only in the manuscripts of Leyden and the British Museum, and is therefore presented both in text and translation.

The reader will see at a glance that the second piece containing the chapter on Shiism is both in size and contents the most important of the texts published below. It is, in fact, the backbone of this treatise. To be sure, the chapter in question, as has already been hinted at, is very far from being an exhaustive or even comprehensive presentation of Shiism. As far as this chapter is concerned, its incompleteness may be explained by the fact that the monograph, of which it originally formed a part, limited itself by the very title to the "depravities," i. e. the extreme sects of the Shi'a. But it must also be admitted that even the description of the extreme sects is fragmentary and abrupt, and that the same abruptness is to be noticed in the other texts. Yet, in spite of this defect, Ibn Hazm's account is of great historical value. It contains a number of facts which have hitherto not been known at all, or been known only in part or in different form. It also reveals a clear and original conception of the nature of Shiism and of the development of its sects. Apart from the general merits characterizing the literary activity of Ibn Hazm, we may conscientiously assert that the information contained in the texts given below contributes a considerable and valuable material towards the history of this important religious movement.

The disconnected and abrupt character of the texts makes a synopsis of their contents almost impossible. On the other hand, this very same circumstance renders a synopsis unnecessary. I will therefore limit myself to a few remarks on Ibn Hazm's division of the sects of the Shi'a, which underlies his whole account. The division of the sects of Islam in general is, mainly because of the baneful hadith, a matter of extreme difficulty and discussion. Shahrastānī, in the introduction to his *Milal wa'n-Nihāl*, justly remarks that he has not found two writers who agreed on this question, and an examination of other Muhammedan histories of religion only confirms this observation. A similar confusion prevails in the division of Shiitic sects in particular. A few examples will suffice to illustrate the infirmity and arbitrariness of all such divisions. 'Abd-al-Kāhir al-Baġdādī (d. 429/1038), a contemporary of Ibn Hazm,¹ who

¹ See later, p. 26.

bestows great pains on a precise classification of the 72 heterodox sects, counts twenty of these to the Shi'a. He distributes these twenty over three main sects: the Zeidiyya (4), the Keisâniyya (1), and the Imâmiyya (15). The Ǧulât ("Extremists") are not reckoned to Islam at all. Shahrastânî (d. 548/1153), on the contrary, counts the Ǧulât (or Ǧâliya) to the Muhammedan sects, and enumerates five Shiitic sects: the Keisâniyya, Zeidiyya, Imâmiyya, Ǧâliya, and Ismâ'iliyya. Makrîzî, again, (d. 845/1442) who knows Ibn Hazm's work and frequently plagiarizes it, follows in the division of sects a system of his own which is highly artificial. All the sects of Islam deviating from the Sunna are considered and called by him Ǧulât, "Extremists," i. e. driving to an extreme the moderate principles of orthodox Islam. These Ǧulât, and with them all heterodox sects, are divided into ten principal categories. The ninth is occupied by the Shiites or, as Makrîzî prefers to call them, the Rawâfid.¹ Twenty sects are numbered under this heading, among them the Imâmiyya, Keisâniyya and Zeidiyya, but also many small and insignificant factions. At the end of his classification, Makrîzî, stimulated by the tendency outlined above, pours out a vast number of other heterodox sects which scarcely have any reality beyond their names.

Ibn Hazm, who rejects the ḥadîth in question, and is in consequence not bound to any number, makes no attempt at an elaborate enumeration of the sects of Islam. In spite of it, or more probably because of it, his division of Muhammedan sects in general and of Shiitic sects in particular is the most natural and logical. Islam is accordingly divided into five sects, or, as the Sunna, properly speaking, is no sect, into four sects: the Mu'tazila, Murji'a, Khawârij, and Shi'a; the two former representing the dogmatic side, the two latter representing the political side of Islam. Kremer, in his "History of the Leading Ideas of Islam" (p. 16 sq.), rightly makes this division of Ibn Hazm the point of departure for his consideration of Muhammedan dogmas. As regards Shiism, Ibn Hazm shows the clearest conception of the problem by laying down the question of the Imâmate as principium divisions. The whole Shi'a accordingly appears divided into two large sections: on the one hand the

¹ See the index to this treatise, s.v. Rawâfid.

Zeidiyya and on the other the Imâmiyya, or, to use the nomen odiosum by which Ibn Hazm as well as other writers often designate the latter, the Rawâfid. Both sections agree in the conception of the Imâmate as the exclusive privilege of the descendants of 'Alî. But they differ in their attitude toward the claims of 'Alî himself, and consequently in their judgment of 'Alî's opponents. In the opinion of the Imâmiyya, 'Alî was entitled to the caliphate by virtue of a written will of the Prophet. The "Companions," however, maliciously made this will disappear. The first caliphs were consequently usurpers and, acting, as they did, against the express wish of the Prophet, must be considered infidels. As such, they cannot be considered the bearers of Muhammedan tradition, and thus; with the exception of the Koran, a complete reorganization of Islam becomes necessary. The Zeidiyya deny the existence of a written will. 'Alî's claims to the Imâmate merely lay in his superior qualities. His rejection on the part of the "Companions" was not prompted by any premeditated malice but solely due to an unintentional lack of appreciation. The first caliphs consequently were legitimate rulers, and they as well as the other "Companions" must be acknowledged as the rightful bearers of Muhammedan tradition. Thus the whole difference between the two sections of Shiism reduces itself to their attitude toward the "Companions" as the bearers of Islam. It is evident that the Zeidiyya are closely related to the Sunna, especially so when we remember that the Sunna itself yielded more and more to the Alidie tendencies prevalent among the masses of the Faithful, whereas the very basis of the Imâmiyya is a protest against orthodox Islam as handed down by the "Companions." In a survey which confines itself to the "*depravities*" of the Shiites there is consequently little room for the Zeidiyya. Only one section of them, the Jârûdiyya, is quoted at the beginning of the chapter on Shiitism (part B. of our text). But it is left unexplained whether they owe this distinction to their belief that the rejection of 'Alî was an intentional act of treachery and that the Companions were consequently infidels, or whether it is due to their belief in the second advent of certain Mahdis,—a belief which they largely share with the Imâmiyya. The tenets of the latter, of course, occupy a much more prominent place among the "*depravities*" of the Shiites, and the bulk of the chapter

is devoted to them. The Ḡulāt—on this point Ibn Hazm agrees with al-Baġdādī—are no Muslims at all. Only inasmuch as their tenets are bound up with the personality of ‘Alī, they are counted among the extreme sects of Shiism.

Between these two well-defined parties the sect of the Keisāniyya, which in early Islam played so important a rôle, occupies a somewhat ambiguous position. All other historians who regard as the basis of Shiism—common both to the Zeidiyya and the Imāmiyya—the restriction of the Imāmate to the descendants of *Fatima*, necessarily place the Keisāniyya, who believe in the Imāmate of Muhammed ibn-al-Hanafiyya, ‘Alī's son by another wife, in a separate category. Ibn Hazm, however, who considers the underlying principle of Shiism the recognition of the Imāmate of the descendants of ‘Alī, obviously makes the question of a written will the point of departure, and, since the Keisāniyya on this cardinal point agree with the Zeidiyya, expressly counts them among the sects of the latter. But our author is not consistent. For in the course of the chapter he reckons the Keisāniyya, on account of some peculiar tenets held by them, among the Imāmiyya. On the whole, it must be said that Ibn Hazm's description betrays a painful lack of disposition. The chapter on Shiism suffers particularly from this defect. The various parts of the account cannot be easily distinguished. It is quite difficult to state where the report on the Zeidiyya ends and that on the Imāmiyya begins. Nor does the description of the individual sects within this range show any proper order. The value of Ibn Hazm's account on Shiism is not to be attributed to its stylistic merits but principally to the facts it communicates and the historical material it contributes towards a better knowledge of the sects of the Shi'a.

The present treatise is based on a monograph by the same author written some five years ago in German. It reproduced the texts now offered in English translation in the original Arabic, as the *Milal wa'n-Nihāl* had not yet appeared in print and was only accessible in manuscripts. The first manuscripts I was able to peruse were those of Leyden and Vienna, which by the courtesy of the respective libraries were sent to me at Strassburg (Germany), where I lived at that time. The text of

the piece which appears here as part A. was based on these two manuscripts. For the second piece, the chapter on Shiism, I was limited to the Codex of Leyden, the Vienna manuscript being defective in this place. The contents of the chapter, which teems with proper names, and the character of the manuscript, which is practically void of all diacritical points, made it impossible to construct any reasonable text on so inadequate a basis. It was then that Professor Goldziher with characteristic kindness offered me his copy of this chapter made by him in 1878 from two twin-manuscripts belonging to Count Landberg one of which is now in the possession of the library of Yale University.¹ This copy presented a different recension of the *Milal wa'n-Nihal*, but it was nevertheless of incalculable value for the establishing of a critical text, and without it any attempt at publication would have proved a failure. As for the last two pieces, given here as C. and D., they were reproduced from the Leyden manuscript only, since their contents on the whole offered no unsurmountable difficulties. The texts constructed in the described manner and accompanied by introduction and notes constituted the said monograph, which was presented to and accepted by the Philosophical Faculty of the University of Strassburg as "Habilitationschrift" preliminary to the author's admission as "Privatdozent." Subsequently, during several visits to London, I was able to consult the codex of the British Museum and, having settled in this country, I also had access to the manuscript stored in the library of Yale University. In the meantime, Ibn Hazm's *Milal wan-Nihal* had appeared in print in Cairo, being the faithful reproduction of a modern manuscript of that city.

All these circumstances greatly influenced the further destinies of the monograph and considerably altered and widened its scope. In the first place, it became necessary to utilize the new material afforded by the study of hitherto inaccessible manuscripts. With the publication of the *Milal wa'n-Nihal* the value of the manuscript extracts was considerably impaired and

¹ In Professor Goldziher's copy the two manuscripts are designated as A and B. The Yale manuscript is unquestionably identical with B, as can be seen from the few passages in which A and B slightly differ from one another (cmp., e. g., p. 48, n. 7). I have been unable to find out where A is at present.

it therefore became advisable to give the texts in translation instead. On the other hand, it was impossible to disregard the aid offered by the manuscripts at our disposal, two of which (those of Leyden and the British Museum) are five hundred years older than the manuscript reproduced in the printed edition. The text of the edition had to be carefully compared with that of the manuscripts, and the variants had to be embodied in the critical apparatus accompanying the translation.

A few remarks concerning the character of the translation offered below may prove useful to the reader. It is an obvious fact for the student of Ibn Hazm's *Milal wa'n-Nihâl* that the text of the edition represents a recension which essentially differs from the manuscripts of Leyden and the British Museum in the greater part of the work, and from the codices of Vienna and the British Museum in the earlier part of it. The recension offered by L. and Br. is apparently younger, and most probably represents a revised edition of Ibn Hazm's work. In spite of this fact the author of the present treatise deemed it his duty to base his translation on the text of the edition which is generally accessible. It was impossible to revise and amplify the printed text by means of the manuscripts, as this would have resulted in an unbearable mixture of recensions, which would have done justice to neither recension. It seemed, on the contrary, advisable to relegate the manuscript variants, however important, into the critical apparatus at the bottom of the translation. On the other hand, it was impossible to reproduce the printed text word for word, as the manuscript, of which the text is a slavish reproduction, is apparently faulty, and full of errors and lacunae. The text of the edition had consequently to be corrected first, and then in this amended form be made the basis of the English translation. The deviations of the latter from the printed Arabic text are made noticeable to the eye: the corrected readings by larger type and the words missing in the edition by square brackets. As regards the various readings, only those were recorded which appeared to be of some value in one way or the other. Mere stylistic variations were disregarded. Wherever the variants contained some historical information, or differed materially from the translated text, they were made conspicuous in type, so as to enable those readers who are merely interested in the historical aspect of the texts, to recognize at a glance

the readings which are of special interest to them. For the convenience of the reader the text was also divided into paragraphs. The manuscripts offer no breaks whatever, and the division in the edition is apparently arbitrary, and in most cases nonsensical. The headings of the various sections of the text were added for the same reason.

The introduction, offered herewith, had to be re-written, so as to include the increased material, now at the disposal of the author, and the results of his continued study of Ibn Hazm's work.

The commentary endeavors above all to be what the word designates: an explanation of the text, which is mostly abrupt and frequently obscure. The scarcity of literature on our subject, however, made it imperative to widen the scope of the commentary, and to include a careful and systematic discussion of the topics treated or suggested by Ibn Hazm. In doing so, the author tried to turn to account the modern literature on the subject in various European languages, so far as it represents original research, and to compile all the material available in Arabic literature. In the latter respect, the author was fortunate enough to have at his disposal a valuable and not inconsiderable material derived from manuscripts. The various manuscripts, quoted in various parts of this treatise, will be designated in due course. Here I will confine myself to a general reference to two manuscripts quoted throughout this treatise, which proved exceptionally valuable for our investigations. Both manuscripts are stored in the Imperial library in Berlin, and are closely related to each other. The one is the *Kitāb al-fark beina 'l-firāk*, "Book on the Differences between the Sects," by Abū Mansūr 'Abd al-Kāhir b. Tāhir al-Bağdādī (died 429/1038, see Ahwardt's Catalogue, No. 2800), and a work of the same title by Shuhfūr b. Tāhir b. Muhammed al-Isfrāñī (died 471/1078, *ibidem* No. 2801). The former is known from a few quotations by Schreiner in ZDMG. (vol. 52) and in his book "Der Kalām in der jüdischen Litteratur"; the latter is often referred to in Haarbrücke's translation of Shah-rastāñī, and in the notes to the edition of the *Fihrist*. Each of these writers is quoted by Hāji Chalfa (vi, 115) as the author of a *Kitāb al-Milal wa'n-Nihāl*, of which frequent mention is also made in the *Kitāb al-fark* of Bağdādī. It appears, in fact, that

the manuscripts in question are extracts from a larger work which may have represented this *Milal wa'n-Nihâl*. The two manuscripts show a remarkable affinity, which deserves further investigation. Materially they coincide nearly everywhere, and frequently they also agree verbatim. As far as I am able to judge, I am inclined to consider Isfrâîn's book an abstract from that of Bağdâdi. The latter displays its genuine character by greater completeness, by personal recollections, by polemical, often quite tolerable, rhymes against the heretics, and the like features. Both manuscripts offer the great advantage of being carefully pointed, which, of course, is of special value in determining the pronunciation of the proper names. But they also contain extremely interesting material, and often supply us with important historical information undoubtedly drawn from old sources. Thus their account on the Sabâîyya offers the fullest and most valuable description of this fundamental sect of Shiism.

The disconnected character of the translated texts, which are derived from various sections of Ibn Hazm's *Milal wa'n-Nihâl* written at various periods, make it impossible to pursue any definite arrangement or disposition. This inconvenience, however, is removed by means of a detailed index, which enables the reader to lay hand on all the material bearing on the subject in which he is interested. The list of the Alids mentioned in this treatise which is appended at the end will, we expect, be of service to the reader.

* *

Before concluding, I feel obliged to tender the expression of my thanks to all those men and institutions that have been helpful to me in the work embodied in this treatise.

The first and largest share of my gratitude I owe, as always, to my dear master, Professor Theodor Nöldeke, who has, with untiring kindness, bestowed upon me the benefit of his instruction and his friendship. Without his continuous stimulus, furtherance and advice, this work would have never been undertaken or finished.

My heartfelt thanks are furthermore due to Professor Goldziher, not only for his repeated public references to the importance of Ibn Hazm's work and his contributions towards the

appreciation thereof, but also for his great kindness in lending me his copy of the chapter on Shiism, and in giving me, whenever required, his invaluable scholarly advice.

I feel greatly obliged to the University library of Strassburg (Germany), where I gathered most of the material for this work, to the officers of the Oriental department of the British Museum, who were unceasing in their efforts to facilitate my task, to the libraries of Leyden, Berlin, Vienna, Gotha and Yale University, for allowing me the use of their manuscripts.

TRANSLATION.

A. The Heterodox Sects in general.

[Printed Edition (=Ed.) II, pp. 111-117; Codex Leyden (=L.) I, fol. 185^a ff.; Codex British Museum (=Br.) I, fol. 185^a ff.; Codex Vienna (=V.) fol. 201 ff.; Codex Yale (=Y.) I, fol. 187^a ff.]

In the Name of Allah, the Compassionate, the Merciful!
Says the Fakih¹ Abū Muhammed, *Alī b. Aḥmad *Ibn Ḥazm*,
may Allah be pleased with him²:

Having with the help of Allah finished with the (non-Islamic) religions, let us with the assistance of Allah begin to describe the sects of the Muslims and the difference of opinion among the latter regarding these sects, to expound³ the evils which some of them (of the adherents of these sects) concocted against it (i. e. against Islam)⁴ by means of the special errors of their sect, and to set forth the arguments which are indispensable in order to indicate clearly the true sect among these (heterodox) sects, —in the same way as we proceeded in dealing with the religions. *Much praise unto Allah, the Lord of all Created Beings: there is no assistance nor strength except in Allah, the Exalted, the Almighty!⁵

Says Abū Muhammed: Those that adhere to the community of Islam are divided into five⁶ sects: 1) the Sunnites, 2) the

¹ Br. + v. تَوْفِيقِي وَصَلَى اللَّهُ عَلَى سَيِّدِنَا مُحَمَّدٍ وَآلِهِ وَحَبَّبَهُ.

² Br. V. om.—L. الفَقِيرُ الْإِمَامُ "the poor, the Imām."

³ Br. V. om.

⁴ Br. V. + جَيْعَ "all."

⁵ Ed. L. بَعْضَهَا "against it," L. V. Y. بَعْضَهُمَا "against them." See Commentary.

⁶ Br. V. om.

⁷ Ed. and Codd. خَمْسَةً (instead of خَمْسٌ) against the grammatical rule.

Mu'tazilites; 3) the Murji'ites, 4) the Shi'ites, and 5) the Khārijites.¹ Each of these sects again is divided into a number of (smaller) sects.

The greatest difference of opinion among the *Sunnites* prevails in questions of religious practice and a few particulars of religious doctrine which will be explained hereafter. As to the other four² sects, enumerated above, there are some among them who differ widely from the Sunnites and others who differ from them but slightly.

Among the sections of the *Murji'ites* the nearest to the Sunnites are those who follow the doctrine of the Fakih Abū Hanīfa that Faith consists in acknowledging the truth both with the tongue and the heart and that the religious ceremonies are nothing but laws and precepts imposed by Faith. The farthest among them are the adherents of Jahm b. Safwān, *al-Ash'arī and *Muhammad b. Karrām of Sijistān.³ For *Jahm and al-Ash'arī maintain⁴ that Faith only consists in believing with the heart, though one profess with his tongue Unbelief and the doctrine of Trinity [112] and worships the Crucified (Christ) *in the dominions of Islam without fear (i. e. compulsion).⁵ *Muhammad b. Karrām, on the other hand, maintains⁶ that Faith is only expression with the tongue, though one adhere⁷ to Unbelief in his heart.

Among the sects of the *Mu'tazilites* the nearest to the Sunnites are the followers of *al-Husein b. Muhammad an-Najjār, Bishr b. Ḥiyāth of Marīs (in Egypt), as well as the followers of⁸

¹ Br.: 4) Khārijites; 5) Shi'ites.

² Ed. L. Y. incorrectly *الآباء*; Br. V. *الآباء*.

³ Br. V. + *وأصحاب* "and the adherents of."

⁴ Br. V. + "and the adherents of."

⁵ In Eastern Iran. Br. V. om.

⁶ L. Y. *بعض هؤلاء يقولون* "some of these maintain." This is a later correction. See Comm.—Instead of *يقولون* in Ed. read *يقولان* as in Br. V.

⁷ L. Y. om.

⁸ L. Y. *وآخرين* (*فإن*) *يقولون* "and others maintain."

⁹ Br. V. *واعتقد* (*فإن اعتقد*). (V. corrected on the margin).

¹⁰ Br. om. through homoioteleuton.

Dirâr b. 'Amr. The farthest among them are the followers of Abû'l-Hudeil.¹

Among the schools of the *Shi'ites* the nearest to the Sunnites are those who count themselves among the followers of the Fakîh al-Hasan b. Sâlih b. Ijâyy² of the *Banû Hamdân*³ who maintain that the Imâmate is confined to the descendants of 'Ali.⁴ It is, however, an established fact that al-Hasan b. Sâlih—may Allah have mercy on him!—was of the same opinion as we are, viz., that the Imâmate extends to the whole of the Kureish, and that he maintained a friendly attitude towards all⁵ the Companions (of the Prophet), the only exception being that he gave 'Ali the preference over all of them.⁶ The farthest among them are the Imâmites.

Among the sects of the *Khârijites* the nearest to the Sunnites are the followers of 'Abdallah b. Yazîd al-Ibâdi,⁷ of Kûfa. The farthest among them are the 'Azrakites.

As to the followers of Ahmad b. Hâ'it,⁸ Ahmad b. Yâñîsh,⁹ al-Fadl of Harrân,¹⁰ the extremists *among the Rawâfid, the Sûfi's,¹¹ the *Bit'tîkhîyyâ*,¹² the followers of Abû Ismâ'il al-Bît-

¹ Ed. misprint الهريل (with ز).—L. Br. V. + "al-'Allâf." See Comm.

وأقرب فرق المعتزلة إلى أهل السنة
صحابي الهدى العلاف وأقرب مذهب الشيعة إلى أهل السنة
 أصحاب ضرار بن عمرو وابعدهم أصحاب أبي الهدى العلاف.

² L. Br. V. حنى. See Comm.

³ Ed. incorrectly الهمدانى (with ز); "of Hamadân" (in Persia).

⁴ Codd. + فقط "alone." ⁵ Br. om. See next note.

وقيل إنّه كان يفضله على عثمان فقط
وV. marginal gloss by another hand
"It is assumed that he gave him the preference over
'Othmân only." ⁶ الياضى Y.

⁷ Ed. Y. حافظ, حابت. V. حابت (sic). See Comm.

⁸ Ed. نابوس, نابوس. V. نابوس. See Comm.

⁹ Ed. الحرمي, الحرمي. V. الحرمي.

¹⁰ L. Y. Om.

¹¹ Ed. البطحي and البطحية with soft ح.

ṭikhi, those of the ‘Ajārida who deny the “Ijmā” and others,—they do not belong to the Muslims, but are unbelievers in the common opinion of the whole Muhammedan nation. Let us seek refuge in Allah, when we are forsaken !

Exposition of the fundamental tenets of each of these sects, being the characteristics by which they are distinguished.

Says Abū Muhammed: As to the *Murji'ites*, the pillar which they hold fast is the question as to the nature of Faith and Apostasy and the proper application of these terms, and Punishment.¹ Outside of this they differ in their opinions as much as the others.

As to the *Mu'tazilites*, the pillar which they hold fast is the question of Unity and the Divine Attributes. *Some of them also add² the problem of Free Will, the application of the terms Wickedness and Faith, and Punishment. In the question of Divine Attributes the *Mu'tazilites* are joined by Jahm b. Ṣafwān, Mukātil b. Suleimān, the Ash'arites and other *Murji'ites*, as well as by Hishām b. al-Hakam, Sheīṭān at-Tāk—whose proper name was Muhammed b. Ja'far, of Kūfa,³—and Dāwūd al-Hawārī, who are all *Shi'ites*.⁴ [113] Yet we mentioned this root as a specific characteristic of the *Mu'tazilites*, because those who speculate about it do not (*eo ipso*) renounce the doctrine of the Sunnites or⁵ that of the *Mu'tazilites*, while the *Murji'ites* and *Shi'ites*, mentioned above, are discriminated by special teachings which actually stand outside the doctrine of the Sunnites and *Mu'tazilites*.

As to the *Shi'ites*, the pillar of their speculation is the question of the Imāmate and the Degrees of excellence of the Companions of the Prophet. Outside of this they differ as much as the others.

As to the *Khārijites*, the pillar of their school is the question as to the nature of Faith and Apostasy and the proper applica-

¹ Br. واعبد (sic). The original reading possibly was الوعيد. “Reward and Punishment.”

² Br. V. “and.”

³ L. Y. om. الكوف.

⁴ Ed. L. Y. شيعة افاضة ; Br. V. شيعة.

⁵ L. Y. “and.”

tion of these terms, the question of **Punishment**,¹ and the **Imāmate**. Outside of this they differ as much as the others.

We have set up these topics as characteristic of the parties in question, because he who, e. g., maintains that the religious practices of the body constitute Faith, since² the latter increases through obedience³ (by observing these practices) and decreases through disobedience⁴ (by neglecting them), and that a believer becomes an unbeliever through the least transgression (regarding these practices), or that even he who is a believer both in his heart and⁵ with his tongue may (nevertheless) suffer eternal punishment in hell, is no *Murji'ite*. He, however, who agrees with them on these points, but differs from them in all other matters regarding which the Muslims are divided in their opinions, is a *Murji'ite*.

He who differs from the *Mu'tazilites* regarding the Creation of the Koran, the Beholding (of God on the day of Resurrection), the Anthropomorphisms,⁶ or regarding their opinion that the man who commits a capital sin is neither a believer nor an unbeliever, but (merely) a sinner, does not belong to them. He, however, who agrees with them regarding the above-mentioned points, is one of them, though he differ from them in all other matters regarding which the Muslims are divided in their opinions.

He who agrees with the *Shi'ites* that 'Alī is the most excellent of men after the Prophet and that he and his descendants after him are worthier of the **Imāmate** than anyone, is a *Shi'ite*, though he differ from them in all other matters regarding which the Muslims are divided in their opinions. He, however, who differs from them regarding the above-mentioned points, is no *Shi'ite*.

¹ Ed. erroneously الْوَعْد “Reward.” Codd. and previously Ed. الْوَعِيد.

² Ed. L. Br. Y. فَإِنْ وَأْنْ “and that.”

³ L. Y. om. بِالطَّاعَةِ.

⁴ L. Y. om. بِالْعَصْيَةِ.

⁵ L. Y. “or.”

⁶ Ed. correctly وَالْتَّشِبِيهُ lit.: “and the comparing” (of God with created beings).—L. Y. وَالْتَّسْبِهُ، V. وَالْتَّشِبِيهُ, Br. Y. وَالْتَّشِبِيهُ.

He who agrees with the *Khârijites* in denying (the right of) appealing to judges and in regarding those that commit capital sins as apostates, also shares with them the belief that rebellion against tyrannical rulers is a religious duty, and that those who commit capital sins suffer eternal punishment in hell, and finally that the Imâmate is also permissible outside of the Kureish, is a Khârijite, though he differ from them in all other matters regarding which the Muslims are divided in their opinions. [If however]¹ he differs from them regarding the above-mentioned points, then he is no Khârijite.

Says Abû Muhammed: As to the adherents of the Sunna, they (alone) are the adherents of truth, while all others are adherents of heresy. For Sunnites were the Companions of the Prophet and the best of the "Followers" who walked in their footsteps, then the masters of the Hadith (Oral Tradition), *the Fâkihs who succeeded them, generation after generation, until this very day and the bulk of the people who emulated their example in the East and the West of the Earth—the mercy of Allah upon them!²

[114] Says Abû Muhammed: There were, however, people who usurped the name of Islam, though all the sects of³ Islam agree that they are no Muslims. Thus there were sections among the *Khârijites* who went to the extreme, maintaining that the salât (obligatory prayer) was no more than one "bow" in the morning and one in the evening. Others permitted the marriage with granddaughters and the daughters of nephews. They also maintained that the Joseph Sûra did not belong to the Koran. There were others among them⁴ who maintained that the adulterer and thief ought to be punished, but then be called to repent their apostasy. If they do so, (then well and good); if not, (only then) they ought to be killed.

There were also sections among the *Mu'tazilites* who afterwards went to the extreme and held the belief in the Transmi-

¹ Ed. om. خیان through oversight.

² L. only وَمِنْ أَتَبَعَهُمْ "and those that succeeded them."

³ Br. V. om. فرق.

⁴ Here begins a lacuna of one leaf in Br. (between fol. 136^a and 137^a).

gration of Souls. Others among them maintained that the fat and the brain of swine was permitted.

Among the *Murji'ites* there were sections who maintained that Iblis never asked permission from Allah to look (at Adam) and that he never admitted¹ that Allah created him out of fire and Adam out of dust.² Others maintained that prophecy could be attained by right conduct.

There were others among the *Sunnites* who went to the extreme,³ maintaining that there were some pious who were superior to prophets and angels, and that he who attained the true knowledge of God was exempt from religious laws and ceremonies. Some of them held the belief that the Creator resides in the bodies of his creatures, like al-Hallâj and others.

There were sections among the *Shi'ites* who afterwards went to the extreme, some of them holding the belief in the divinity of 'Alî b. Abî Tâlib and the Imâms after him. Some of them believed in his [as well as in their]⁴ prophecy, also in the Transmigration of Souls, like the poet as-Sayyid al-Himyârî and others. One section of them believed in the divinity of Muhammed b. Abî Zeinab, a client of the Banû Asad. Another section believed in the prophecy of Muqîra b. 'Sa'îd, a client of the Banû Bajila,⁵ in the prophecy of Abû Mansûr al-'Ijlî (of the Banû Ijlî), of the weaver Bazîg,⁶ of Bayân⁷ b. Samî'an, belonging to the Banû Tamîm and the like. Others among them held the belief in 'Alî's re-appearance on earth. They

¹ V. + "منذ امتنع من السجود لآدم" "when he refused to prostrate himself before Adam." See Comm.

² V. + (gap of one word). . . . ولا بأن الله كرم آدم عليه ولا بان الله "nor that Allah honored Adam more than him, nor that Allah"

³ Ed. erroneously فغلوا instead of ففعلنوا.

⁴ Ed. erroneously om. ونبوة ولدة وبنبوتهم .

⁵ Ed. and Codd. + Abî. See Comm.

⁶ Ed. misprint for بجيلا .

⁷ L. بزيع, Ed. بزيك, V. بزيك (on the margin corrected by another hand بزيع, Y. بزيع).

⁸ L. وبنان. . . . وبنان. See Comm.

refused to believe in the open meaning of the Koran, asserting that the open meaning should be interpreted allegorically. Thus they maintained that "the Sky" was Muhammed and "the Earth" his Companions. (In the verse) "Behold, Allah commandeth you to slaughter a cow"²²—"a cow" means N.N., i. e., the Mother of the Faithful. They equally maintained that "Justice" and "Charity"²³ referred to 'Ali and that "Jibt" and "Tâgût"²⁴ were N.N. and N.N., alluding to Abû Bekr and 'Omar. They similarly maintained that "salât" (obligatory prayer) meant supplication to the Imâm, "zakât" (alms) donations to the Imâm and "hajj" (pilgrimage) going to the Imâm. There were among them stranglers and skull-breakers.

None of these sects cares in the least for logical demonstration. The only proof they possess is the claim of inspiration, impudence and the capacity to lie openly. [115] They pay no attention²⁵ to any argumentation. But it suffices to refute them by saying: "What is the difference between you and those who claim that they were informed by way of inspiration of the absurdity of your belief?" There is no way to extricate oneself from this (reply). Besides, all the sections of Islam hold themselves aloof from them, regarding them as apostates and unanimously agreeing that their belief is not that of Islam. Let us seek refuge in Allah, when we are forsaken!

Says Abû Muhammed: The reason why most of these sects deserted²⁶ the religion²⁷ of Islam is, at bottom, this. The Persians originally were the masters of a large kingdom and had the upper hand over all the nations. They were in consequence possessed with such mighty self-esteem²⁸ that they called themselves "nobles" and "sons," while the rest of mankind were

²¹ Koran XXX, 24.

²² Koran II, 68.

²³ Koran XVI, 72.

²⁴ Koran IV, 54 (the names of two idols).—For "Jibt" Ed. L. erroneously احْبَث "abomination."

²⁵ Ed. يلتغفون; L. Y. ينتقرون ("to be amended"; Lane, s. v.) V. متعقون.

²⁶ Read خروج اکثر as in L.—V. Y. om. اکثر "most of."

²⁷ V. دائرۃ "the circle."

²⁸ Ed. الخطیر, read الخطیر; V. الخطیر.

regarded by them as slaves. But when they were visited (by God) and their empire was taken away from them by the Arabs,—the same Arabs who in the estimation of the Persians possessed the least dignity of all nations,—the matter weighed much more heavily upon them and the calamity assumed double proportions in their eyes, and thus they made up their mind to beguile Islam by attacking it at different periods. But in all this Allah makes Truth come to light. Among their rebels were **Sunbād**,¹ **Ustādsīs**,² al-Muḳanna', Bābak and others. **Previous**³ to these appeared with the same intention 'Ammār, with the nickname Khidāsh,⁴ and Abū Muslim⁵ as-Sirāj.⁶ When they saw that to entrap Islam by trickery was more profitable, some of them outwardly professed Islam and won the sympathies of the people with Shi'itic inclinations, by feigning affection for the members of the prophetic family and by condemning the injustice done to 'Alī. Thus they led them about on various paths, till at last they carried them away from Islam.

Some people among them lured them into the belief that a man by the name of "al-Mahdi" (the rightly Guided) was to be expected, who was the only one in possession of true⁷ religion, since religion could not be accepted from those "Apostates,"—the companions of the Prophet being accused by them of apostasy. Some went as far as to believe in⁸ the prophecy of those for whom they claimed prophecy, and some of them, as already mentioned, led them astray on the path leading to the belief in

¹ Ed. سَقَادَةٌ, V. سَقَادَةٌ, L. Y. Makrizī, *Khitāṭ* ii, 362 (quotation from Ibn Ḥazm), Mas'ūdī, *Murūj ad-Dahab* (vi, 188)

سَفَادَ.—The correct reading Tabarī, *Annales* III, 119.

² Ed. يَاسِدَسِيسٌ, V. اسْتَاسِيسٌ, L. Makrizī, *ib.* اشْنِيسٌ.—The correct reading Tab. III, 354.

³ Ed. misprint قَبْلٍ for قَبْلَ.

⁴ Ed. and Makrizī خَدَاشٌ, V. خَدَاش, Y. حَدَاش, L. unpointed.

⁵ Ed. misprint سَلَمٌ.

⁶ V. مَكْرٌ, Makr. السُّرَاحٌ.—See Comm.

⁷ V. om. حَقِيقَةٌ.

⁸ L. V. Y. + ما ذَكَرْنَا مِنْ "what we mentioned of."

incarnation and exemption from religious ceremonies. Some again made fun (of them)¹ by imposing upon them fifty obligatory prayers² every day and night, while others reduced them to seventeen³ obligatory prayers, with fifteen⁴ "bows" in each,—the latter being the opinion of 'Abdallah b. 'Amr b. al-Háarith,⁵ before he became a Khárijite of Sufritic persuasion. On the same road also went the Jew 'Abdallah b. Sabá, the Himyarite. For he, too,—Allah curse him!—outwardly professed Islam in order to beguile⁶ its adherents. He also was the main factor in instigating the people against 'Othmán. 'Ali b. Abí Tálib burned certain groups⁷ of them who publicly proclaimed his divinity. From [116] these baneful roots sprang up the Ismailites and Karmatians, two sections who publicly renounce Islam altogether and profess not only the purest Magism but also the doctrine⁸ of Mazdak⁹ the Móbád¹⁰ who lived at the time of Anúshirwán b. Kabád,¹¹ the king of the Persians, and who advocated the necessity of communism regarding women and property. Says Abú Muhammed: When they had brought¹² the people¹³ as far as these two narrow passes, they turned them¹⁴ away from Islam, as they pleased,—which in fact was their only intention.

¹ Y. + **بِهِمْ**.

² Here Br. begins again (fol. 137^a).

³ Ed. Br. Y. 17; L. V. 19. See Comm.

⁴ Ed. L. incorrectly **خمسة عشر**; Br. V. **خمس عشرة**.

⁵ Y. al-Hárb. See Comm.

⁶ Ed. **لَيْكِيد**; Codd. more smoothly **لَيْكِيد**.

⁷ Br. V. sing.

⁸ V. more explicitly **بِمَدْهُبِ**. L. Y. **ذَهَبٌ**.

⁹ Ed. Y. **مرْدَك**.

¹⁰ Ed. Y. **الْمُوْبَدُ**.

¹¹ Ed. Y. **قِيَاد**, V. **قِيَاد**, L. unp.

¹² Ed. **بَلَغُوا**. Codd. correctly **بَلَغُوا**.

¹³ Y. "the unfortunate one," see next note; V. on the margin
+ **وَالنِّسَاءُ** "and the women."

¹⁴ Ed. L. Y. **أَخْرَجُوهُ** "him," supporting the reading of Y.; see preceding note.

By Allah, by Allah, ye servants of Allah ! Fear ye Allah in your souls and be not by any means seduced by adherents of unbelief and heterodoxy or by those who embellish their words not with logical proof, but with mere forgeries,¹ who advise (you) contrary to the messages of the Book of your Lord and of the words of your Prophet: for there is no good in anything besides these two. Know ye that the religion of Allah is open, with no hidden² meaning in it, public, with no secret behind it, all of it logical demonstration, with no laxity about it. Suspect ye everyone who calls on you to follow him without proof and everyone who claims for religion secrecy and a hidden meaning, for (all such claims) are nothing but presumptions and lies. Know ye that the Apostle of Allah did not conceal even as much as a single word of the Law, nor did he allow even those who were nearest to him, viz., his wife, daughter, uncle or cousin on his father's side, or any of his companions, as much as a glimpse into anything appertaining to the Law, which he should have kept back from the Red and Black and the humblest shepherds. The Prophet did not keep to himself any secret or allusion or any hidden explanation, besides the message which he brought to the whole of mankind. Had he withheld from them anything, then he would not have delivered (his message)³ as he was commanded. He who holds such an opinion⁴ is an apostate. Be ye on your guard against any opinion whose way is not clear and whose proof is not distinct. **Do not swerve**⁵ in the slightest from the views held by your Prophet and his Companions!

Says Abū Muhammed: We have already set forth the disgraceful tenets of all these sects in a short book of ours, entitled:⁶

¹ Ed. بتمویهات the only correct reading.—L. Br. v. تماوت, Y. بتماون.

² Br. V. باطل “absurd.”

³ Br. V. بلغهم + “to them.”

⁴ Br. V. غیر هنّا “another opinion.”

⁵ Ed. تعوّجا. Codd. better تعوّجوا : Y. تعوّجوا in a similar meaning.

⁶ Ed. اسمه.—Codd. سمه “designated as.”

"The saving advices against the disgusting infamies and pernicious depravities contained in the beliefs of the adherents of heresy among the four sects: the Mu'tazilites, the Murji'ites, the Khārijites and the Shi'ites." We subsequently appended it at the end of our exposition on the sects in this work.¹

The consummation of all good² is that you should cling to the text which your Lord wrote down³ in the Koran—in Arabic language, making clear, with no negligence whatever as regards clearness, everything—as well as the words which are firmly established as those of your Prophet through the traditions of the reliable authorities⁴ among the Imāms (leaders) of⁵ the masters of the Ḥadīth, *in a chain leading up to the Prophet:⁶ both ways [117] will enable you to attain the satisfaction of your Lord.

We shall forthwith proceed [to discuss]⁷ the topics which are the pillar concerning which the Muslims are divided in their opinions, i. e., Unity, Free Will, Faith, Punishment, the Imāmate and the Degrees of excellence (of the Companions) and then finish with those matters which the Mutakallimūn call "latā'if" (subtleties). We shall set forth all *the proofs they adduce⁸ and expound with convincing arguments the points of truth in all this,—in the same way as we proceeded previously,⁹ with Allah's assistance unto us and his support. There is no assistance nor strength except in Allah, the Exalted, the Almighty.

¹ L. Y. om. this sentence. See my essay: "Zur Komposition von Ibn Hazm's *Milal wan-Nihāl*" in Nöldeke's *Jubelschrift*, i, p. 278.

² Br. V. ... الخبر information."

³ L. Br. V. عليه—Ed. Y. علىكم is not as good.

⁴ Ed. erroneously spelt الثقة.

⁵ Br. V. om. أئمّة .

⁶ L. Y. om.

⁷ Codd. بـالـكلـام فـيـ الـكـلام (Br. بالكلام في الكلام). Ed. om. probably owing to homoioteleuton.

⁸ Br. V. ... احتجـ بهـ كـلـ طـائـفةـ مـنـهـمـ "every party of them adduces."

⁹ Br. V. instead فيـ الـمـلـلـ "with the religions."

B. The Heterodoxies of the Shi'ites.

[Printed Edition (=Ed.) IV pp. 178-188; Codex Leyden (=L.) II fol. 185^a ff.; Codex British Museum (=Br.) III fol. 87^a ff.; Codex A III fol. 105^a ff.; Cod. Yale (=Y.) III fol. 70 ff. The variants quoted anonymously are taken from L. and Br. and, if not otherwise stated, are identical in both Codices. The readings of Y. are, if not otherwise stated, identical with those in A. On Codex A and the other codices see Introduction, pp. 17 and 24.]

*'Description of *the grave errors² leading to apostasy or absurdity contained in *the views of the adherents of heresy: the Mu'tazilites, the Khârijites, the Murji'ites and the Shi'ites.'*

Says Abu Muhammed:⁴ We have already described in this work the infamies of the religions opposed to Islam [and the lies]⁵ which are found in their Scriptures, viz., those of the Jews, Christians and Magicians, besides which nothing remains⁶ for them,⁷ so that nobody who becomes acquainted with them (their Scriptures)⁸ will doubt that those people are engrossed in error. Now let us proceed with these four sects and describe their detestable tenets so that this work may render clear to every reader that they are engrossed in error and absurdity, and may thus prevent those whom Allah wishes to guide the right

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ صَلَى اللَّهُ عَلَى سَيِّدِنَا مُحَمَّدٍ وَآلِهِ وَسَلَّمَ +
وَآلِهِ وَصَحْبِهِ وَسَلَّمَ (Br.). See "Zur Komposition von Ibn Ḥazm's Milal wan-Nihâl," p. 272, n. 2.

² الشَّرَفُ "the depravities."

³ يَدْعُ الرَّافِضَةَ وَالخَوَارِجَ وَالْمَعْتَرِلَةَ وَالْمَرْجِئَةَ "the heresies of the Rawâfiḍ, the Khârijites, the Mu'tazilites and the Murji'ites." See "Zur Komposition, etc." p. 274, n. 1. See Comm.

⁴ Y. (also later) + رَضَّة.

⁵ Ed. Y. om. ، وَالْكَذْبُ which is indispensable.

⁶ Ed. Y. بَقِيَّةً ; L. Br. بَيْنَ "proof." See Commentary.

⁷ وَالْحَمْدُ لِلَّهِ رَبِّ الْعَالَمِينَ +
Created Beings!"—also مَمَّا لَا instead of لَا.
⁸ عَلَيْهِ "with it."

way from joining them or from continuing [to be]¹ with them. There is no assistance nor strength except in Allah the Exalted, the Almighty.

We wish, however, the reader of this our book² to understand that we do not consider permissible—as do those in whom there is no good—to quote in anyone's³ name any statement which he⁴ did not make verbatim, though the (general) view (conveyed by the quotation) may go back to him (the quoted person). For the latter may not always cling to the consequences following from⁵ his (general) view and thus a contradiction may appear (between the quotation and the actual opinions of the quoted writer). You must know that quoting in anyone's name—be he an infidel, a heretic or a (mere) sinner—a statement which he did not make verbatim is equal to telling lies about him, and lying is not allowed against anybody. On the other hand, they sometimes hide detestable ideas behind ambiguous expressions, so as to make them more attractive to ignorant people and to those of their followers who think well of them⁶ and to make it difficult for the bulk [179] of their opponents⁷ to grasp⁸ (the full significance of) the heresy in question. Thus when certain sections among the adherents of

¹ Ed. om. على الكَوْنِ.

² كلامنا "our words."

³ من خُصُومنَا + "anyone of our opponents."

⁴ نَقْلَةٌ "we" which makes no sense.

⁵ نَتْجَعْ "II conclure, tirer des conséquences (Dozy). Cf. also I. Friedlaender, Sprachgebrauch des Maimonides I (1902) sub voce.—Y. بِيَحِّى" "permitted by."

⁶ L. + "He says"; Br. + "Says Abū Muhammed."

⁷ I follow the reading of L. Br. وَعَلَى مَنْ أَحْسَنَ الظَّنَّ بِهِمْ "Ed. Y. يَحْسِنُ النَّظرُ بِهِمْ" is against the construction, both of the phrase and the verb نَظَرَ in this meaning being followed by فَ. —

⁸ Ed. Y. incorrectly مُخَالِفَتِهِمْ.—Ed. Y. مُخَالِفَتِهِمْ.

⁹ Om. فَبِهِمْ .

heterodoxy and fallacy¹ say²: God cannot be described as having the power to do something absurd, or unjust, or false,³ or anything of which he does not know beforehand that it will happen,⁴ they (deliberately) conceal the gravest heresy in this proposition, in order to mollify⁵ the illiterate among their adherents⁶ and appease the crowd of their opponents. (They do so), because they are afraid of openly declaring⁷ their belief which in fact means that the Almighty has no power over injustice, nor strength over falsehood, nor might over absurdity. We are necessarily compelled to disclose forgeries of this kind and expose them in the clearest possible terms. We thus hope to get near Allah by rending asunder their veils and disclosing their secrets.⁸ "Allah is sufficient for us. He is an excellent Protector!"⁹

Description of the Depravities of the Shi'ites.

Says Abū Muhammed : The adherents of depravities (heterodoxies) belonging to this sect are divided into three sections.

- I. The first of them is the *Jāridiyya*, a part of the Zeidiyya.
- II. Then the *Imāmiyya*, belonging to the Rawāfid, and finally

III. the *Extremists*.

^١ ^{الْمُنَكَّدِينَ فِي دِينِ اللَّهِ عَزَّ وَجَلَّ +} "those who go astray from the religion of Allah."

^٢ ^{أَذْ +} "since" which makes no sense. It is probably to be corrected in ^٣ ^{أَنْ} "that."

^٤ ^{وَلَا عَلَى الدُّعَاءِ إِلَى الْبَاطِلِ +} "or to call (mankind) to anything nonsensical."

^٥ ^{يَفْعُلُهُ} "that he will do it."

^٦ ^{قَاتِلِيسْ (L. Br. unpointed)} "to bring into despair" which makes no sense.

^٧ ^{وَمَقْلُدِيهِمْ +} "and their imitators."

^٨ ^{خُبُثُ +} "the ugliness of."

^٩ ^{وَتَنْفِيرُ النَّاسِ عَنْ ضَلَالِهِمْ +} "and to make people flee from their fallacy."

¹ Koran III, 167.

I. As to the *Jârûdiyya*, a part of them believed in Muhammed b. 'Abdallah b. al-Hasan b. **al-Hasan**¹ b. 'Alî b. Abî Tâlib, the same² who rose in Medina against Abû Ja'far al-Mansûr. The latter dispatched against him³ 'Îsa b. Mûsa b. Muhammed *b. 'Alî b. 'Abdallah⁴ b. al-'Abbâs, who killed Muhammed b. 'Abdallah *b. al-Hasan, Allah have mercy on him!⁵ This section then believed that the said Muhammed was alive,⁶ that he was never killed, that he never died⁷ nor will ever die until he has filled the earth with justice as it is filled with iniquity. Another section of them believed in Yahya b. 'Omar *b. Yahya⁸ b. al-Husein⁹ b. Zeid d. 'Alî b. al-Husein b. 'Alî b. Abî Tâlib, who rose in Kufa¹⁰ in the days of¹¹ al-Musta'in. Muhammed b. 'Abdallah b. Tâhir b. al-Husein b. Muş'ab, the wâli of Bagdad for al-Musta'in, dispatched against him the son of his paternal uncle al-Husein b. Ismâ'il b. Ibrâhîm b. Muş'ab, the nephew of Ishâk b. Ibrâhîm b. Muş'ab,¹² who killed Yahya b. 'Omar, Allah have mercy on him! The said section then believed that this Yahya b. 'Omar was alive,¹³ that he was never killed, *that he never died¹⁴ nor will ever die until he has filled the earth with justice as it is filled with iniquity.—

¹ Ed. and Codd. al-Husein.

² هو +

³ ابْنَ اخِيهِ "the son of his brother."

⁴ Om.

⁵ Om.

⁶ إِلَى الْيَوْمِ + "until this day."

⁷ وَانْهَا حَتَّى بِالْحَاجِرِ مِنْ جَبَلِ رَضْوَى + "and that he lived in Hajir in the mountain of Radwâ."

⁸ Om.

* Al-Hasan.

¹⁰ عَلَى "against" instead of أيام (also later).

¹¹ I follow the reading of L. Br. ابن مصعب والي بغداد للمستعين

ابن عمّة الحسين بن اسماعيل بن ابراهيم بن مصعب وهو ابن بأمر المستعين.—اخى اسحاق بن ابراهيم بن مصعب بن عمّة (sic) الحسن بن اسماعيل بن الحسين وهو ابن اخى طاهر ^{is by order of al-Musta'in the son of his paternal uncle (read عمة) al-Hasan (sic) b. Ismâ'il b. al-Husein, the son of the brother of Tâhir b. al-Husein."} See Comm.

¹² إِلَى الْيَوْمِ + "until this day." ¹³ Om.

Another section believed that Muhammed b. al-Kâsim b. 'Alî b. 'Omar b. 'Alî b. al-Husein b. 'Alî b. Abî Tâlib, who rose in Tâlikân¹ in the days of al-Mu'tâsim, was alive, that he never died, *nor was ever killed² nor will ever die until he has filled the earth with justice as it is filled with iniquity.

The *Keisâniyya*, the followers [of Keisân Abû 'Omra, one of the followers]³ of al-Mukhtâr b. Abî 'Ubeid⁴—they are in our opinion a branch⁵ of the Zeidiyya in their tendency⁶—that Muhammed b. 'Alî b. Abî Tâlib—i. e., Ibn-al-Hanafiyya—was (still) alive in the mountains⁷ of Rađwâ, having on his right a lion and on his left a leopard, conversing with angels, his sustenance coming to him in the morning and in the evening, that he never died, nor will ever die until he has filled the earth with justice as it is filled with iniquity.

II. *Some of the Imâmitic Rawâfid—I refer to the sect⁸ called al-*Mamṭâra*—believed that Mûsa b. Ja'far b. Muhammed b. 'Alî b. al-Husein b. 'Alî b. Abî Tâlib was alive, that he never died [180] nor will ever die until he has filled the earth with justice as it is filled with iniquity. Another group of them, viz, the *Nâwusiyya*, the followers of⁹ Nâwus¹⁰ of Bašra,¹¹ believed *the same of his father Ja'far b. Muhammed.¹² Another group believed

¹ من بلاد خراسان + "in the lands of Khorâsân."

² Om.

³ كيسان ابى عمرة وكان من اصحاب Ed. Y. om. through homoioteleuton.

⁴ + "of the Banû Takifa."

⁵ شيعة , Br. شيعة , L. شيعة .

⁶ Lit.: "path."—L. Br. سبلهم plural.

⁷ Sing.

⁸ Merely فرقة من الرافضة وقالت "a section of the Rawâfid." See Introduction, pp. 22 and 23.

⁹ L. Br. A. + *Ibn.*

¹⁰ اووس.

¹¹ Ed. Y. "from Egypt." See Comm.

ان جعفر بن محمد بن علي بن الحسين بن علي بن ابى طالب حتى لم يميت ولا يموت حتى يملأ الأرض عدلا كما ملئت جورا "that Ja'far b. Muh. b. 'Alî b. al-Hus. b. 'Alî b. A. T. was alive, that he never died nor will ever die until, etc." The same elaborate formula instead of مثل also later.

the same of his brother Ismā'il b. Ja'far. The **Sabā'iyya**,¹ the followers of the Jew² ‘Abdallah ibn Sabā the Himyarite, believed the same of ‘Alī b. Abī Tālib, adding³ that he was in the clouds. But I wish I knew in what particular cloud he is to be found, there being so many clouds in the different zones of the earth “that are compelled to do service between heaven and earth,” as Allah the Almighty said.⁴ *The said ‘Abdallah ibn Sabā, having received the news of ‘Alī’s murder,⁵ expressed himself in these terms: “Even if you had brought us his brains in **seventy bags**,⁶ we would not be convinced of his death. He will surely not die until he has filled the earth with justice as it is filled with iniquity.” Some of the **Keisāniyya** *believed that Abū Muslim as-Sirāj was alive and has not died, and that he will undoubtedly appear again. Others of the **Keisāniyya**⁷ believed that ‘Abdallah b. Mu‘āwiya b. ‘Abdallah b. Ja‘far b. Abī Tālib was alive in the mountains of Isbahān until this day and will undoubtedly appear again. This ‘Abdallah is the same who rose in Fāris in the days of Merwān b. Muhammed and was killed by Abū Muslim, after the latter had kept him in prison for a long time.⁸ This ‘Abdallah held detestable⁹ opinions in religious matters, being a Nihilist and seeking the company of the Dahriyya.

¹ Ed. Y. **Sabābiyya**. Br. unpointed; L. as above. See Comm.

² فَكَانَ يَهُودِيَا فَأَظْهَرَ إِلَاسْلَامَ “he was a Jew but outwardly professed Islam.” Cf. p. 87.

³ وَقَالُوا “maintaining.”

⁴ Koran II, 159.

⁵ وَلَمَّا قِيلَ لِابْنِ سَبَّا أَذْ وَرَدْ قُتْلَ عَلَى رَضْمَةَ قَدْ مَاتَ عَلَى “When it was said to Ibn Sabā, after the murder of ‘Alī had taken place: ‘Alī has died.’”

⁶ I follow the reading of A. فِسْبَعِينَ صَرَّةَ, see Comm. Ed. Y. فِسْبَعِينَ مَرَّةً “70 times.” L. Br. ضَرْبَةٌ (Br. unp.) “70 blows” which makes no sense.

⁷ L. om. through homoioteleuton.

⁸ مَدَّةً “a while.”

⁹ فَاسِدٌ “corrupt.”

Says Abū Muhammed: These people only follow in the footsteps of the Jews who believe that *Malkizedek [b. Fālīg] b. ‘Ābir [b. Shāliḥ] b. Arphakhshad b. Sām b. Nāh¹ and the servant whom Ibrāhīm dispatched to woo Ribkā,² the daughter of Bethu’āl³ b. Nākhūr⁴ b. Tārikh for his son Ishāk, and Ilyās (Elijah) and Phinħās b. Al’āzār⁵ b. Hārtūn are alive until this day.⁶ The same direction is also taken by some silly⁷ Ṣūfis, who affirm that Ilyās and al-Khaḍir are both alive until this day, some of them even claiming that they⁸ met Ilyās in deserts⁹ and al-Khaḍir on lanes and meadows,¹⁰ and that the latter, whenever called, instantly appears¹¹ before the man who has called him.

Says Abū Muhammed: How does al-Khaḍir accomplish it, *if he is called in the East, the West, the North and the South¹² and¹³

¹ Ed. Y. ملکیصیدق بن عامر (عابر ي.) بن ارخشد الح. —
L. Br. also add Methusalem, but the reading is corrupt: متواشیخ
بن خنوح وان العبد مليك صدق (ملکیصیدف Br.) بن عامر
—. بن حام (عام Br.) بن ذوح see Commentary.

² Ed. Y. L. Br. ربعا ريقا.

³ Ed. Y. بنوآل .

⁴ ابوم .

⁵ Algāzār.

⁶ فی الدنیا ولا یدرون این هم + where they are."

⁷ Ed. Y. ترکی makes no sense. L. Br. ذوکی (L. under it in tiny letters plural of the elativ نوکی = احمق و عقلسی انوک).

⁸ Ed. Y. singular اذه يلقی (), taking the preceding بغض as "one." The singular, however, contradicts the statement in the next paragraph.

⁹ الموحشة ويلقون "lonely (deserts) and met."

¹⁰ التی فيها العيون والانهار + in which there are wells and rivers. (Br. om. والانهار .)

¹¹ Br. خطى "presents himself."

¹² إن ذکرة ذاکرون معاً في أقصى الشرف if the people call him simultaneously in the extreme East, etc. أقصى added to each direction.

¹³ Om.

in thousand different places in the same instant? (Yet) we met several people¹ who held this belief, among them [Muhammed b. 'Abdallah b. Salām al-Anṣārī]² known as Shukk al-Leil, traditionist³ in Ṭalabīra, who *in spite of it⁴ belongs to the influential circles and masters⁵ a great amount of traditions;⁶ among them also the Kātib Muhammed b. 'Abdallah, who told me that he *many times⁷ sat with al-Khadhir and conversed with him, and many others. (They believe) all this, despite their knowing the saying of Allah: "But (he is) the Apostle of Allah and the seal of the prophets,"⁸ and the words of the Apostle of Allah: "There is no prophet after me."⁹ How then can a Muslim think it permissible¹⁰ to assume [after this that]¹¹ there is a prophet on earth after Muhammed, with the exception, stipulated by the Apostle of Allah, of the miracles which, according to reliable tradition, are certain to take place in connexion with 'Isa b. Maryam's advent at the end of Time?

The heretics of [181] Baraqwātah expect *until this day¹² Sāliḥ b. Tarif, who instituted for them their religion.¹³

*The *Kittī'iyya*, of the Imāmitic Rawāfiḍ—they constitute the bulk of the Shi'ites, and to them belong the dogmatists and thinkers as well as the large numbers (of the Shi'ites)—all believe¹⁴ that Muhammed b. al-Hasan b. 'Alī b. Muhammed *b. 'Alī¹⁵ b. Mūsa b. Ja'far [b. Muhammed]¹⁶ b. 'Alī b. al-Husein b.

¹ جماعة “a large number.”

² Ed. Y. om. Supplied from L. Br.

³ Om.

⁴ Om.

⁵ Only *الرواية*.

⁶ Om.

⁷ Koran XXXIII, 40.

⁸ L. gives a long marginal gloss, on which see Comm.

⁹ يُسْتَخْبِر (Br. unp.) “ask,” which makes no sense.

¹⁰ بَعْدَ هَذَا أَن Ed. Y. om. owing to homoioteleuton. ¹¹ Om.

¹² إِلَى أَن قَطَعَ اللَّهُ آثَارَهُمْ جَمِيلَةً فِي وَقْتِنَا هَذَا وَلَلَّهُ الْحَمْدُ¹³

“Until Allah stamped out their vestiges altogether in our own time. Praise unto Allah!” See Comm.

¹⁴ وقالت القطبيعة كلها وهم من الإمامية من

“الرافضة اليوم وفيهم متكلموهم ونظاروهم وعمدتهم” All the K.—they now belong to the Imāmiyya of the Rawāfiḍ and among them are their dogmatists and thinkers as well as their center of gravity—believe.”

¹⁵ Om.

¹⁶ Ed. Y. om.

'Alī b. Abī Tālib is alive, that he never died nor will ever die until he will appear and fill the earth with justice as it is filled with iniquity. He is in their opinion the Mahdī, the Expected.¹ A section of them maintains² that *the birth of this one who (in reality) was never created took place³ in the year 260—*the year when his father died.⁴ Another section, however, maintains that he was born some time after his father's death. Still another section maintains that he was, on the contrary, born during the lifetime of his father. They report this in the name of Ḥuḳeīma,⁵ the daughter of Muḥammad b. 'Alī b. Mūsa.⁶ *(They also report) that she was present at his birth and heard him speak and recite the Koran the moment he fell out of the womb of his mother,⁷ and that his mother was Narjis and that she herself (Ḥuḳeīma) was his nurse.⁸ The majority⁹ of them, however, say that his mother was Ṣakīl and a part of them say that his mother was Sausan. *But all this is humbug,¹⁰ for the above-mentioned al-Hasan left no children,¹¹ neither male nor female. Such is the first folly¹² of the Shi'ites and the key to

المنتظر المهدى . ^١ Ed. misprint **وبقول**.

^٢ مولده ^٣ "his birthdate (was)." ^٤

وهو عام موت الذى تذكره (نكره بـ L. ، منكرة Br.) انه ابوه وهو آخر ائمتهم . ^٤ "This is the year of death of him whom (that section) mentions as being (Br. whom we deny to be) his father. He is the last of their Imāms."

ورروا في ذلك خرافات . ^٥ "they report about this a silly story."—Instead of there is a blank both in L. and Br.

أخت على وعمة المحسن المذكور + . ^٦ "the sister of 'Alī and the aunt of the above-mentioned al-Hasan."

وذكرت انها كانت قابلته وانها سمعته حين ولد تتكلم وقرأ . ^٧
وانها كانت هي آيات من القرآن دان امة فرجس . ^٨ Ed. Y.

وانها هي كانت .

^٩ طائفة ^{١٠} "a part."

^٩ + Says Abū Muḥammad.

^{١٠} كذب موضوع "fabricated lie."

^{١١} اصلاً "at all."

^{١٢} قول "belief."

their grave errors¹ of which this one is the least grave, though (sufficient) to lead to perdition.

All these,² when³ asked to prove what they say, reply : Our proof is Inspiration, and he who contradicts us is of illegitimate birth. "This is **strange**⁴ indeed ! I wish I knew the difference between them and the **opposite attitude**⁵ of those who claim Inspiration while proving the absurdity of their assumptions and (maintaining) that the Shi'ites⁶ are of illegitimate birth⁷, or that they are idiots⁸, or that they all have forking projections⁹ on their heads. *What would they say of one who had belonged to them but then went over to the others, or one who had belonged to the others and then went over to them ? Do you believe that he is transferred¹⁰ from an illegitimate birth

¹ عجایبهم which evidently stands for عجائبهم "their curiosities."

² ومن عجایبهم (sic) انهم . . . الحجّة في ذلك كله قالوا .

³ Ed. and Codd. اذن "since." Read إِذَا.

⁴ + Says Abû Muhammed.

⁵ Ed. and Codd. طریقاً. I read "strange" (Lane).

⁶ Ed. Y. عیار from III عیار "to equalize, adjust," which conveys no proper sense. L. عناد (Br. uncertain). I read from عنده III "to oppose, contradict."

⁷ الرافضة .

⁸ Ed. رشدۃ.—Read لرشدۃ as in Br. Y.—L. الرشدة .

⁹ Ed. نوکی which is perhaps to be read نوکی, comp. p. 46, note 7.
وأنهم كلهم أولهم عن او انهم نوکة Instead of the Codices have نوکة

¹⁰ آخرهم ينكحون في مخارجهم "and that all of them, from the first to the last, ineunt mulieres in latrinis suis." Ed. no doubt intentionally omitted.

¹⁰ Ed. من جنون.—ذو شعبه من جنون "of madness," om. in all Codices and is most probably a gloss. See Comm.

¹¹ Differently worded
ثم نقول لكم ما قولكم فيمن كان منكم ثم خرج عن دينكم وصار في سائر فرق المسلمين او فيمن كان مخالفًا لكم ثم دخل في دينكم أتراكها ينتقلان .

to a legitimate one or from a legitimate birth to an illegitimate one? Should they say: his case¹ depends on his condition at his death, then one² ought to reply to them: (If so), then perhaps *you*³ are of illegitimate birth, since it is not impossible that you will all one by one return to the reverse of what you believe today. Surely, they all are people of foul opinions, of weak minds and of no shame.⁴ Let us seek refuge in Allah *from Error.*

V
‘Amr b. Bahr al-Jâhîz—one of those frivolous men who are mastered by the desire for a joke, and one of those who lead into error,⁵ yet one, as we found, who in his books never sets forth a lie deliberately and assertively, though he often enough sets forth the lies of others—(al-Jâhîz) narrates the following: Abû Ishâk Ibrâhîm⁶ an-Nazzâm and Bishr b. Khâlid⁷ told me that they once said to Muhammed b. Ja‘far the Râfiqîte, known as Sheitân at-Tâk: *“Woe unto thee!⁸ Art thou not ashamed *before Allah⁹ of what thou hast asserted in thy book on “the Imâmate” that Allah never said in the Koran: ‘The second of two: when they were both in the cave, when he said unto his companion: Be not grieved, for Allah is with us!”?” They both continue to narrate: “By Allah, Sheitân at-Tâk thereupon

¹ اهنا + “surely.”

² قلنا : “we.”

³ كلکم + “all.”

⁴ بالجملة + “whatever.”

⁵ ممّا ابتلاهم به “from that with which he tempted them.”

⁶ قال Ed. misprint **الصلال المضللين** instead of the reverse.—Y. + قال Allah تعلى ولا تَمْشِ فِي الْأَرْضِ مَرَحًا “Allah says: Walk not proudly in the land” (Koran XVII, 39). This is evidently the gloss of a reader.

⁷ Om.

⁸ وهو ايضا من وجوه المعتزلة “he also was one of the leaders of the Mu‘tazilites.”

⁹ Om.

¹⁰ اما أَنْقَبْتَ اللَّهَ عَزَّ وَجَلَّ “doest thou not fear Allah?”

¹¹ Koran IX, 40.

broke forth into¹ long laughter so that² (we felt) as had *we* been the evildoers." An-Nazzām narrates: "We often spoke with³ 'Alī b. Mītām⁴ as-Sābūnī (the soapboiler)—he was one of the doctors of the Rawāfid and one of their dogmatists—and we would occasionally ask him [for some information, which he would give us. When we asked him]:⁵ 'Is it (i. e., your information) an opinion (of your own) or an oral information⁶ (coming) from the Imāms?'" he would deny that he gave it of his own opinion. We then reminded him⁷ of what he had said about the same thing on a previous [182] occasion." He (an-Nazzām) continues: "By Allah, I never saw him blush for it or feel ashamed of having done it."

One of the tenets of the Imāmite—both ancient and modern—is that the Koran was interpolated by adding passages that were not in it, by removing a great number (of verses) from it and altering a great number (of verses) in it. The only exception is 'Alī b. al-Husein⁸ b. Mūsa⁹ b. Muhammed¹⁰ b. Ibrāhīm b. Mūsa b. Ja'far b. Muhammed b. 'Alī b. al-Husein¹¹ b. 'Alī b. Abī Tālib, who was¹² an Imāmite, yet at the same time openly declared his schism (in this question). He always denied this belief¹³ and declared those who entertained it apostates.¹⁴ Of the same opinion (with him) were his two followers Abū Ya'la¹⁵

¹ عَاتَرْأٌ+ "sudden, unexpected." Originally said of an arrow of which the shooter is not known. See Lane s.v.

² كَلَّنَا نَحْنُ وَكَانَ + "we had to blush and."

³ وَكَانَ يَكْلِمُنَا "('Alī b. Mītām) often spoke with us."

⁴ Ed. Y. مَبْيَم, Br. مَتَبِيم, L. unp.—See Comm.

⁵ Ed. Y. om. عن مَسْئَلَة فَيَجِيبُ فِنْسَالٌ owing to homoioteleuton.

⁶ وَرَايَةٌ "oral tradition." ⁷ Sing.

⁸ Ed. misprint فَتَخَبَّرَ . ⁹ Ed. Y. al-Hasan.

¹⁰ Om. ¹¹ Ed. Y. al-Hasan.

من رُوسَاء الْإِمَامَيَّةِ وَمُتَكَلِّمِيهِمْ وَكَانَ مَعَ ذَلِكَ يَظَاهِرُ وَيَجَاهِرُ ¹² "one of the heads of the Imāmite and one of their dogmatists. Yet, at the same time he openly and publicly declared his schism."

¹³ Only قال به وَيَكْفُرُ بِهِ which is probably a mistake for ¹⁴ Ed. Y. L. يَعْلَى عَلَى.—Br. يَعْلَى is probably a correction.

Sabalān (?)¹ of Tūs and Abū'l-Kāsim ar-Rāzī (of Rai-Teheran). Says Abū Muhammed: The belief that there are interpolations between the two covers (of the Koran) is pure² apostasy and³ equal to declaring the Apostle of Allah a liar.

A section of the *Keisāniyya* believed in the Transmigration of Souls and this belief was upheld by the poet as-Sayyid al-Himyārī, Allah curse him! Those who believed in it were so possessed with this idea⁴ that one of them would take a mule or a donkey and hit it and torture it and withhold from it drink and food, on the ground that it bears the spirit of Abū Bekr and 'Omar.⁵ Marvel at this folly,⁶ which has no parallel to it!⁷ For by what right has this miserable mule or unlucky donkey been distinguished by transferring to it the spirit (of Abū Bekr and 'Omar), more than all other mules and donkeys? They do the same thing to a she-goat, on the ground that she bears the spirit of the Mother of the Faithful.

The bulk of their⁸ dogmatists like Hishām b. al-Hakam of Kūfa,⁹ his pupil¹⁰ Abū 'Alī ash-Shakkāk¹¹ and others maintain that God's knowledge is created and that he knew nothing until he created knowledge for himself:—¹²this is pure apostasy.¹³

¹ L. سبلان, Br. unp. Ed. Y. ميلاد. See Comm.

² صريح “unadulterated” (the same variant also later).

³ لاذه “because it is.”

⁴ Ed. Y. وبلغ الجنون بهن L. Br. : ويبلغ الامر بهن يذهب يذهب “frenzy.”

⁵ + or 'Othmān. See Comm.

⁶ لهذه الرعونة . . . لها.

⁷ يا ليت شعرى ما + “I wish I knew.”

⁸ + Says Abū Muhammed.

⁹ الأول + “early.”

¹⁰ مولى بنى اسد + “a client of the Banū Asad.”

¹¹ Om.

¹² Ed. Y. L. Br. (sic). See Comm.

¹³ + Says Abū Muhammed.

¹⁴ تجهيل لله عز وجل (L. om.) “لاذه because it means to declare God ignorant.”

The same Hishâm, when once arguing with Abû'l-Hudeil al-'Allâf,¹ declared that² his Lord was seven spans (measured) by his own spans:—this is pure apostasy.³ Dâwud al-Hawârî—one of their greatest dogmatists, asserted that his Lord was flesh and blood (and) of human shape.

They unanimously hold that the sun was turned back twice for 'Ali. Is there more stiffness of face⁴, hardness of cheek,⁵ lack of shame⁶ and courage * to lie?⁷ (And all this) despite the nearness of age⁸ and the multitude of people.

¹⁰A section of them maintains that God sometimes wants a thing and decides upon it; then something occurs to him and he leaves it undone. This view is known as that of the Keisâniyya.

¹¹Among the Imâmites there are some who permit *to marry⁹ nine wives. Others forbid¹⁰ cabbage¹¹, on the ground that it only grew from the blood of al-Husein, and had never existed before.

¹²This assertion resembles in its small amount¹³ of shame the previous one. *In the same way¹⁴ many of them asserted that 'Ali *never had a namesake before him.¹⁵ But this is frightful ignorance. On the contrary, there were *many among the Arabs¹⁶

¹ + "in Mekka."

² طول + "the length of."

³ لانه استهزأ بالله عز وجل + "because it means ridiculing God."

⁴ Ed. Codd. الجواري ; الجواري .

⁵ Plural.

⁶ Plural.

⁷ الحياة "life," which makes no sense.

⁸ على المبالغة لجميع اهل الأرض بالكذب "to stupefy all the people of the earth with lies."

⁹ ممن كان في ذلك العصر + "to those who lived in that generation."

—L. Br. om. وكثرة الخلق .

¹⁰ L. Br. om. the whole paragraph. ¹¹ + "Says Abû Muhammed."

¹² Om.

¹³ أكل + "the eating of."

¹⁴ Erroneously الارنب "hare."

¹⁵ + Says Abû Muhammed.

¹⁶ عدم "lack" (of shame).

¹⁷ Om.

¹⁸ لم يسم هذا الاسم أحدا (sic) قبله .

¹⁹ جماعة في الجاهلية "a large number at the time of Ignorance."

who were called by this name, like 'Alî b. Bekr b. Wâ'il, to whom every Bekrite in the world traces his origin.¹ *There was an 'Alî among the Azd and an 'Alî among the Bajila as well as in other (tribes). Every one of these was well-known in the time of Ignorance.² Nearer than³ this was 'Âmir b. at-Tufail with the Kunya Abû 'Alî.

Their public assertions⁴ are, however, more numerous than those mentioned.

There is a section among them maintaining that Paradise and Hell will decay. On the other hand, there are some among the Keisâniyya who maintain that this world⁵ will never decay.

There was one section among them called al-Bajaliyya⁶ [183] tracing its origin to *al-Hasan b.⁷ 'Alî b. Warsand al-Bajali.⁸ He belonged to the people of Nafta,⁹ of the district of Kafsa¹⁰ in Kastilia,¹¹ of the lands of Ifrikiya. Then this infidel started for as-Sûs at the extreme end of the lands of the Maṣāmida, whom he led astray, also leading astray the Amîr of as-Sûs Ahmad b. Idris b. Yahya b. Idris b. 'Abdallah b. al-Hasan¹² b. al-Hasan¹³ b. 'Alî b. Abî Tâlib. They are very numerous

¹ Om. فِي نَسْبَةٍ. See Comm.

وَعَلَى بْن جَسْمَرِ بْن مُحَارِبِ بْن خَصْفَةِ (حَصْفَةُ) بْن قَيْسِ بْن عَيْلَانِ بْن مُضْرِ وَعَلَى بْن مُسْعُودَ بْن مَازِنِ بْن دَتْبٍ كَانَا أَخَا عَبْدِ مَنَّا مِنْ كَنَانَةٍ وَحِصْنَ وَلَدَ أَخِيهِ فَنُسَبُوا إِلَيْهِ وَكَانُوا يُعْرَفُونَ فِي الْجَاهِلِيَّةِ بِبَنِي عَلَىٰ وَفِي بَجِيلَةٍ اَيْضًا وَغَيْرِهَا. See Comm.

² Om. : من "the nearest."

³ وجاهرات الرافضة "the publ. ass. of the Rawâfiḍ."

⁴ L. Br. "Paradise."—Br. as Ed. "الجَنَّةُ."

⁵ الحَمِيلَةُ, الحَمِيلَةُ A. الحَمِيلَةُ, Br. الحَمِيلَةُ, Y. الحَمِيلَةُ. See Comm.

⁶ Ed. Y.; الْحَمِيلَةُ Y.; الْحَمِيلَةُ L. Br. unp.

⁷ A. ; نقطةً. — Br. نقطه.

⁸ Om. Ed. Y. — قَصْصَةُ قَسْطِيلِيَّةٍ. I read "Kafsa in K."

⁹ Ed. Y. al-Husein. — ¹⁰ L. Br. al-Husein.

there, dwelling in the environments of the city of as-Sûs, openly professing their unbelief. Their prayers are different from those of the Muslims. They eat no fruit whatever whose root has been manured. They maintain that the Imâmate is confined to the descendants of al-Hasan, *to the exclusion of the descendants of al-Husein.¹

To them also belonged the followers of *Abû Kâmil*. One of their beliefs was that all the Companions became apostates after the death of the Prophet by disclaiming the Imâmate of 'Alî, and that the latter, too, became an apostate by conceding the rule first to *Abû Bekr*, then to 'Omar, then to 'Othmân. The bulk of them, however, add that 'Alî and those that followed him returned to Islam, having asserted his rights *after the death of 'Othmân², by uncovering³ his face and unsheathing⁴ his sword, while before this they had drifted away from Islam and had become apostates and polytheists. Among them there were also some who put the whole blame in this matter on the Prophet, because he did not explain the question in a manner removing all doubt. Says *Abû Muhammed*: All this is pure apostasy and no hiding of it is possible.

These are the doctrines⁵ of the Imâmites, who among the sects of the Shi'a are *moderate as regards "Extremism."

III. As to the *Extremists* among the Shi'ites, they are divided into two parties: 1. one attributing prophecy after the Prophet to some other person,⁶ 2. the other attributing divinity to anyone beside Allah, thus joining the Christians and the Jews⁷ and betraying religion in a most detestable manner.

وبلغنا الآن أنَّ عبد الله بن ياسين¹ + "خاصةٌ"
"المطهور رحمة الله أبادهم جملةٌ"
We have now been told that
'Abdallah b. Yâsîn al-Muttaawwi' (*the Devout*, see *Lane and Dozy s.v.*)
—*Allah have mercy on him—destroyed them completely.*

² Om. ³ وَذَكَرْشَفْ instead of *وَذَكَرْشَفْ*.

⁴ L. سَيِلْ, which makes no sense.

⁵ شُنْعٌ "the depravities."

⁶ "المتأخرة عن"
"keeping back from."

⁷ Om. "فَخَرَجُوا عن الإسلام" + لغيره
"thus deserting Islam."

⁸ Instead of "the Jews"; وسائل الكفار "and the rest of the Infidels."

1. The party which admits *prophecy* after the Prophet is divided into various sects.

To these belonged the *Gurâbiyya*.¹ Their opinion was that Muhammed resembled 'Ali more closely than one raven the other and that Allah had dispatched Jibril with a revelation² to 'Ali, but Jibril mistook Muhammed for him.³ Yet⁴ Jibril is not to be blamed as he (only) made a mistake.⁵ There was, however, a section among them who said that Jibril did it purposely and they declared him an apostate and cursed him, may Allah curse them!—Says Abû Muhammed: Did anyone ever hear of more weak-minded people and more finished idiots than these here⁶ who assume that Muhammed resembled 'Ali? For Heaven's sake! *How could there exist a resemblance between a man of forty and a boy of eleven years, so that Jibril should have mistaken him?⁷ Besides, Muhammed was⁸ above middle-size (tending) towards tallness,⁹ erect¹⁰ like a spear, with a thick beard, big black¹¹ eyes, full thighs, with little hair on his body, but rich

¹ L. الغائب، Br. العائب.

² + ملائكة "and a message."

³ Instead of بمحمد more explicitly فاتى الى محمد "and he came to M."

⁴ + ثم اختلفوا فقالت فرقاً "then they disagreed and a section of them said"; this is probably the correct reading.

⁵ + لشدة شبهة (Br. تشبّه) "by reason of the strong resemblance between Muhammed and 'Ali."

⁶ قولهم instead of قوم.

كيف يُشبه شبهها يغلط فيه أتم الناس كلها ابن اربعين سنة
صبياً ابن عشر سنين فكيف ان يغلط في ذلك افضل خلق الله
وأنتم تمييزاً وعصمة "How could a man of forty bear so strong a resemblance to a boy of ten that the most perfect of all men should err therein? How much less could err in such a thing the most excellent of Allah's creatures and the most perfect of them, as regards discrimination and virtue!"—"The most perfect of all men," which can only refer to the Prophet, does not convey a proper sense in this connection.

⁷ + حينئذ "then."

⁸ + (الطول) أقرب "nearer" (to tallness).

⁹ L. فديم, Br. فدم.

¹⁰ Ed. Y. ادعج without sense.—L. Br. as translated.

curls.¹ ‘Alī on the contrary was² below middle size, (tending) towards shortness,³ stooping frightfully, as though he had been broken and then reset, *with a mighty beard which covered his chest⁴ from one shoulderbone to the other, *when he had become bearded,⁵ with heavy eyes,⁶ with thin thighs, [184] mightily⁷ bald, with no hair on his head *except a tiny bit in the back of it,⁸ but with much hair on his body.⁹ Marvel at the silliness¹⁰ of this pack.¹¹ For even granted that Jibril made a mistake—though far be it from the faithful¹² Holy Spirit¹³,—how could Allah have neglected *to rectify and¹⁴ to enlighten him and (how could he) have allowed him to abide¹⁵ by his mistake twenty-three years?¹⁶ But even more strange¹⁷ than all this: who could have told them this story and who could have imposed upon them this¹⁸ fable, since this can only be known to one who was present when Allah gave the order to Jibril and then was present at his disobeying it? Upon them the curse of Allah, the curse of those who

¹ وَافِرُ الْحَيَّةٍ + “with a rich beard.”

² حِينَئِذٍ ضَبْيَ امْرَدْ ثُمَّ اذْ كَبَرَ كَانَ + “then a beardless boy. When he had grown up, he was.”

³ أَقْرَبُ (إِلَى الْقَصْرِ) أَقْرَبٌ + “nearer” (to shortness).

⁴ مُفْرَطٌ سَعَةُ الْحَيَّةٍ + “with an exceedingly rich beard.”

⁵ Om. كَبِيرٌ هُمَا + ⁶ كَبِيرٌ هُمَا + ⁷ مُفْرَطٌ + “both big.” “exceedingly.”

⁸ إِلَّا صُوفٌ صِيفَ فِي قَفَاهٍ + “except a tuft on his occiput.” Lit., “a tuft which was tufted.” I owe this explanation to Professor Torrey.

⁹ Ed. Y. الْحَيَّةٌ + “beard,” which makes no sense.—L. Br. الجَسَدُ + “body.”

¹⁰ لِإِفْرَاطٍ + الطَّائِفَةٌ + “at the exaggeration.” ¹¹ حَتَّىٰ + “party.”

¹² Om. مِنْ ذَلِكَ +

¹³ Om. فَتَرَكَهُ + ¹⁴ فَتَمَادَىٰ + (فَتَرَكَهُ) فَتَمَادَىٰ +

¹⁵ إِنْ فِي حُمْقَهُمْ لَعْبَةٌ لِمَنْ آعْتَبَرَ + “Verily, in their stupidity there is a warning for those who accept a warning!”

¹⁶ Ed. Aَظْرَفَ . I read أَطْرَفَ . See p. 49, n. 5.

¹⁷ اخْرَافَةً + الْحَسْكِيَّةٌ + “vile.”

curse¹, and the curse of the whole of mankind² so long as human beings will last before Allah in his world !

One section believed in the prophecy of 'Ali.³ Another section believed that 'Alī b. Abī Tālib, al-Hasan, al-Husein,⁴ 'Alī b. al-Husein⁵, Muhammed b. 'Alī, Ja'far b. Muhammed,⁶ Mūsa b. Ja'far, 'Alī b. Mūsa, Muhammed b. 'Alī, ['Alī b. Muhammed],⁷ al-Hasan b. 'Alī⁸ and the Expected,⁹ the son of al-Hasan, were all prophets.¹⁰ Another section believed in the prophecy of Muhammed b. Ismā'il b. Ja'far only. This is the party of the *Karmatians*. Another section believed only in the prophecy of 'Alī and his three sons: al-Hasan, al-Husein and Muhammed b. al-Hanafiyya. This is the party of¹¹ the *Keisāniyya*. Al-Mukhtār¹² was constantly attempting¹³ to claim prophecy for himself: he spoke in rhymes¹⁴ and warned them against turning aside from Allah, several groups¹⁵ of the cursed Shi'ites following him in¹⁶ this belief. He¹⁷ advocated the Imāmate of Muhammed b. al-Hanafiyya.

¹ Cf. Koran II, 154; L. Br. + **وَالْمَلَائِكَةَ** "and of the angels."

² The following om.

³ + **بْنُ ابْي طَالِبٍ وَحْدَهُ** "b. Abī Tālib alone."

⁴ Ed. Y. + **رَضِيَّهُمْ**.

⁵ L. om. 'Alī b. al-Husein through homoioteleuton.

⁶ + **رَضِيَّهُمْ**.

⁷ Ed. and Codd. om. See Comm.

⁸ Ed. and Codd. Muhammed. See Comm.

⁹ + **وَهُوَ مُحَمَّدٌ** "i. e. Muhammed."

¹⁰ **رَسُولُ اللَّهِ تَعَالَى** + "Apostles of Allah."

¹¹ Instead of **طَائِفَتَانِ** erroneously **طَائِفَةَ مِنْ**.

¹² **الْعَنَةُ اللَّهُ** + ("Allah curse him!"

¹³ Ed. correctly ; Y. حَوْمٌ, see Dozy s.v. Lit.: "turning around."

L. Br. حَرَمْ.

¹⁴ L. erroneously **شَجَاعَاءِ** وَ **شَجَاعَاءِ**.

¹⁵ **طَائِفَةَ** "a group."

¹⁶ **تَصْدِيقٌ** + "holding true."

¹⁷ **مَعَذْلَكَ** + "at the same time."

One section believed in the prophecy of *al-Mujira b. Sa'íd*, a client of the Bant Bafila in Kufa, the same whom Khalid b. 'Abdallah al-Kasrī burned at the stake. This Muğíra—may Allah curse him!—used to maintain that *the object of his worship¹ had the shape of a man with a crown on his head and that his limbs were according to the number of the letters of the alphabet, the Alif, for instance, corresponding with the thighs, *and similar things, for which no tongue of one who belongs to any branch of religion will ever loosen itself.² Allah is mightily exalted above the assumptions of the Unbelievers! He—Allah curse him!—also maintained that *the object of his worship,³ when intending to create the world,⁴ uttered his Greatest Name which⁵ fell down on his crown. Then he wrote down with his finger [on his palm]⁶ the actions of men, both the good and the bad ones. But when he beheld the bad actions, sweat trickled down from him on account of it.⁷ From this sweat two lakes were gathered: one salty and dark, the other light and sweet. Then he looked into the lake and beheld his shadow.⁸ *He started to catch it,⁹ but it flew away. *At last he caught it.¹⁰ He plucked out the eyes¹¹ of his shadow and, grinding them, created out of them the sun¹² and another sun. He created the Infidels out of the salty lake and the Faithful out of the sweet lake, with an ample mixture of both. One of his beliefs also

¹ رَبْهُ “his Lord.” See Comm.

² وَعَدَ ذَلِكَ مَا لَا يُنْتَلِقُ لَنَا لِسَانٌ بِحَكَائِتِهِ أَصْلًا “and besides this (things) which to record no tongue will loosen itself for us in any way.”

³ رَبْهُ “his Lord.”

⁴ Ed. Y. الخلق, lit. “the creation.” L. Br. الجنة “Paradise.”

⁵ فَطَارَ + “flew and.”

⁶ L. Br. + عَلَى كَفَّهٍ; Ed. Y. om. ⁷ Om. كَفٍ.

⁸ Ed. ظُلْمَةٌ “darkness.” Y. ظُلْمَة, L. Br. (and Ed. next line) correctly ظُلْمَة.

⁹ Br. om., apparently through oversight.

¹⁰ فَادْرَكَهُ فَاخْذَهُ.

¹¹ Incorrectly عَيْنِينِينَ.

¹² وَالْقَمَرُ + “and the moon.” See Comm.

was that the prophets never differed in anything concerning the religious laws. It has been assumed that Jâbir b. Yazîd al-Ju'fi, the same who received traditions from ash-Shu'bi, was the successor of al-Mugîra b. Sa'id,¹ when Khâlid *b. 'Abdallah al-Kasrî² had burned him. When Jâbir died, he was succeeded³ by Bekr al-A'war (the Blind) al-Hijrî, and when he (too) died, they transferred the leadership to 'Abdallah, the son of al-Mugîra, their above-mentioned head.⁴ They existed in Kûfa in compact numbers. The last opinions at which al-Mugîra b. Sa'id arrived were his belief in the Imâmate of Muhammed b. [185] 'Abdallah b. al-Hasan b. al-Hasan⁵ and the prohibition of the water of the Euphrates and of any⁶ river, well⁷ or cistern, into which anything unclean has fallen. Under these circumstances those who advocated⁸ the Imâmate of the descendants of al-Husein⁹ held themselves aloof from him.

One section believed in the prophecy of *Bayân b. Sam'ân*, Tamîmite by descent. Khâlid b. 'Abdallah al-Kasrî burned him together with al-Mugîra b. Sa'id on the same day. Al-Mugîra b. Sa'id shrank in a most cowardly manner from clasping the bundle of wood,¹⁰ so that he had to be tied to it by force. Bayân b. Sam'ân, on the contrary, ran to the bundle and clasped it without flinching and without showing any sign of fear. Then Khâlid said to both their followers: "In everything, indeed, you behave like lunatics. This one ought to have been your¹¹ head, not that

¹ على اصحابه + "over his companions."

² Om. ³ + فيهم "among them." ⁴ Om. رَبِيْسَهُم .

⁵ Ed. and Codd. al-Husein.—L. Br. + يومئذ (Br.) وهو حَيٌّ (وَحْيَدٌ) "Shâb fû'iq al-ushri'in 'amâ" وَكَانَ الْمُغِيرَةُ يَقُولُ بِتَحْرِيدٍ "who then was alive, a youth of a little over twenty. Al-Mugîra advocated the prohibition."

⁶ Ed. Y. + ماء "water of." It is most probably a repetition of the word before. ⁷ Om. او عين .

⁸ فَتَبَرَّى مِنْهُ كُلُّ مَنْ يَقُولُ "Al-Hasan.

⁹ وَجَرَعَ جَزْعًا مَفْرَطًا "and was exceedingly terrified." القصْبَ

¹⁰ رَبِيْسَهُم "their."

fool.¹ Bayān b. Sam‘ān, Allah² curse him, maintained that God would entirely decay, excepting only his countenance. This lunatic actually thought that he was supported in this his heresy by the saying of Allah: “Every creation that is on it is subject to decay, and remain will only the countenance of your Lord.”³ But had he only possessed an ounce of reason or understanding, then he would have known that Allah’s statement about decay only refers to the things on earth, *in agreement with the text of the truthful saying:⁴ “Every creation that is on it is subject to decay.” But Allah does not attribute decay to *that which is not on earth.⁵ Allah’s countenance is surely Allah,⁶ not a thing different from him.⁷ *Far be it from Allah that division and fraction should be attributed to him.⁸ This is only the attribute of the created, limited beings, but not the attribute of one who is not⁹ limited¹⁰ and has no equal.¹¹ He—Allah curse him!—also maintained that it was he¹² who was meant by the saying of Allah: “This is an illustration (bayān) for mankind.”¹³ *He also adhered to the doctrine¹⁴ that the Imām was [Abū]¹⁵ Hāshim ‘Abdallah b. Muhammed *b. al-Hanafīyya¹⁶ and that then it (the Imāmate) passed over to all the other descendants of ‘Alī.¹⁷

¹ L. المُفْشل (Br. الفشل) “coward.”

² L. om.

³ ذو الجلال والإكرام + ⁴ glorious and honorable.—Koran LV, 26-27.

⁵ لقوله عز وجل في الآية المذكورة ⁶.

⁷ غير ذلك ⁸ نفسه + himself.

⁹ عز وجل ولا جارحة ¹⁰ ولا عضراً + ¹¹ nor an organ, or a limb.

¹² تعالى (عن +) ان يوصف بالتبعيض والإيجاء.

¹³ Y. om. ¹⁴ L. بخفي، Br. بخفى “concealed”? ¹⁵ وَهُدًى + ¹⁶ هُوَ + ¹⁷.

¹⁸ وَهُدًى + ¹⁹ and guidance.—Koran III, 132.

²⁰ وكان يقول ²¹ Ed. Y. om.

²² b. ‘Alī b. A. T.

²³ من صلح لها منهم + ²⁴ those of them who were fit for it.”

A section of them believed in the prophecy of [*Abū*]¹ *Mansūr al-Mustanīr*² al-‘Ijlī (of the Banū ‘Ijlī), the same whose nickname was “al-Kisf”³ (the Fragment). He claimed⁴ that he was meant by the saying of Allah: “If they should see a fragment of the heaven falling down.”⁵ He was crucified by Yūsuf b. ‘Omar in Kūfa. He also—Allah curse him!—pretended that he was lifted up to heaven and that Allah, putting him on his head with his hand, said to him: “Go forth, [o] my child,” and deliver (a message) from me.”⁶ The oath of his followers was: “No, by the Word!” He also—Allah curse him!—maintained that the first beings⁷ created by Allah were ‘Isā b. Maryam and ‘Alī b. Abī Tālib. He held the belief in the uninterrupted succession of apostles. He permitted forbidden things, viz. adultery, wine, (the eating of) dead animals,⁸ swine and blood, maintaining that they were nothing but proper names of men,—the bulk of the Rawāfiḍ are still of the same opinion to-day. He abolished the obligatory prayers, alms, fasts⁹ and pilgrimage. His followers were all stranglers and skull breakers, just as were the followers of al-Muḡīra b. Sa‘id. Their reason for this was that they did not permit the use of arms before he whom they expected would come forth. They consequently killed the people only by means of strangling and breaking the skull,

¹ Ed. Y. om.

² Ed. *المستير*.

³ L. + صَلِيبَةٌ ; Br. صَلِيبَةٌ or صَلِيبَةً = صَلِيبَةٌ by (his) descent.

⁴ Br. *بالكشف*.

⁵ Ed. erroneously *يقال* instead of *يقول*.

⁶ + مَرْكُومٌ سَحَابٌ يَقُولُوا “they would say: it is a thick cloud.”—Koran LII, 44.

⁷ Br. om.

⁸ ابْنَى, probably more correct than Ed. Y. بُنَى.

⁹ Cf. Koran V, 71.

¹⁰ Ed. Y. مَنْ ; L. Br. مَا “things.”

¹¹ وَلَمْ “the meat of.”

¹² Sing.

while the *Khashabiyya* confined themselves to wooden arms.¹ Hishám b. al-Hakam the Ráfidite² in his book, known under the title “al-Mizán” (the Balance),—he knew them better than anyone else, because he was their neighbor in Kúfa and their *associate in doctrine³—mentions that the *Kisfiyya* particularly⁴ kill *both their adherents⁵ and opponents saying: “We (only) hurry⁶ the Faithful to Paradise and⁷ the Infidels to Hell.” After the death of *Abú Mansúr⁸ they used to deliver a fifth of the goods taken away from those [186] they killed by strangling [or breaking their skulls]⁹ to al-Husein,¹⁰ the son of Abú Mansur.

¹ The last two sentences more explicit in L. Br. ومعناهم في اقتصارهم على الخنق (الحق Br. err. والرَّضْح واقتصار الكيسانية على القتال بالخشب فقط انهم لا يستخلون حمل شيء من السلاح الحديد أصلاً ولو قُتلوا حتى يخرج الذي ينتظرونوه فحيثند يحملون السلاح فهم أنما يقتلون بالخنق والرَّضْح بالجحارة وبالخشب فقط

“The reason for their confining themselves to strangling and skull breaking and the *Keisániyya* confining themselves to fighting with wooden arms only, is that they do not allow to carry any iron weapon whatsoever, even if they be killed, until he whom they expect will come forth, when they will again carry arms. They therefore kill only by means of strangling and breaking the skull with stones and wooden arms.”

الاوض :

² Ed. Y. L. Br. وجارهم في المذهب وشقيقهم في دعوى الشیعَة.—“and their twinbrother as regards the pretensions of the Shi'ites.”

³ “they are the Mansúriyya.” وهم المنصورية +

⁴ “every one whom they are able to kill, (both those belonging) to them.” كل واحد منْ قُدِرٍ عَلَى قَتْلَهُ مِنْهُمْ +

⁵ يُجَبُ أَنْ نَعْجَلُ “it is necessary that we should hurry.”

⁶ وَانْ نَعْجَلُ “and that we should hurry.”

⁷ Y. al-Mansúr.—L. Br. + لعنة “(Allah) curse him!”

⁸ او رَضْخُورَة om. in Ed. Y.

⁹ Ed. Y. al-Hasan.

His followers were divided into two sections:¹ one maintaining that after² Muhammed b. ‘Alī b. al-Husein³ the Imāmāt⁴ passed over to Muhammed b. ‘Abdallah b. al-Hasan b. al-Hasan;⁵ the other maintaining (that it passed over) to *Abū Mansur⁶ al-Kisf and would never return to the descendants of ‘Alī.

One section⁷ believed in the prophecy of *Bazīg*,⁸ the weaver, in Kūfa. That this claim (to prophecy) should have been raised⁹ by them in favor of a weaver is strange¹⁰ indeed! *Another section believed in the prophecy of *Mu‘ammar*, the corndealer, in Kūfa.¹¹ Another section believed in the prophecy of ‘Omeir at-Tabbān¹² (the strawdealer) in Kūfa. He was—Allah¹³ curse him—in the habit of saying to his followers: “If I wanted to turn this straw into pure gold, I could do it.” He presented himself before Khālid¹⁴ b. ‘Abdallah al-Kasrī and courageously¹⁵

وافتقت المتصورة فرقتين احدهما قالت . . . والفرقة الأخرى.

¹ موت + “the death of.”

² Ed. Y. al-Hasan.

³ Ed. Y. erroneously الامامة instead of الامام.

⁴ Ed. al-Husein.

⁵ L. Br. al-M.; Ed. Y. Abū al-M.

⁶ + “of the *Khaffābiyya*.”

⁷ L. Br. الحادك; يربع الحادك.

⁸ Ed. Y. تكشف = نكشف — L. Br. وقع “revealed itself.”

⁹ Ed. Y. طریف — L. Br. طریفه; طریفه لطریفه. “strange” (Lane).—See p. 57, note 17.

¹¹ Only in Ed. and A. Y. om. L. Br. instead ¹⁰ طریف — L. Br. طریفه من *الخطابیة بنیوہ سری الأقصم بالکوفة* another group of the *Khaffābiyya* believed in the prophecy of *Sarī al-Akṣam* in Kūfa.” See Comm.

¹² البتان.

¹³ Om.

¹⁴ + b. al-Walid, apparently owing to a confusion with Khālid b. al-Walid, “the sword of Allah,” the famous general under the first caliphs.

¹⁵ Om. تجلد.

denounced him. Khālid then gave orders to execute him and he was killed, in addition to the curse of Allah.¹ *These five sects all belong to the sects of the Khaṭṭābiyya.²

A section of (our) ancients,³ the partisans of the Abbasides, believed in the prophecy of ‘Ammār, *with the nickname *Khidāsh*.⁴ Asad b. ‘Abdallah, the brother of Khālid b. ‘Abdallah *al-Kasrī,⁵ got hold of him and killed him, in addition to the curse of Allah.⁶

2. The second party among the sects of the Extremists is that which attributes *divinity* to anyone beside Allah.

The first of them were certain people among the adherents of ‘Abdallah b. *Sabā* the Himyarite, may Allah curse him!⁷ They came to ‘Alī b. Abī Tālib and said⁸ in his face: “Thou

¹ وَيَئُسَ الْمَهَادُ + “and an unhappy couch shall it be.” Koran II, 202.

² وَكَانَ هَاوِلَاءُ كُلُّهُمْ مِنْ أَعْبَابِ أَبْيَ الْخَطَابِ لَعْنَهُ اللَّهُ + all these belong to the followers of Abūl-Khaṭṭāb, Allah curse him!—L. Br. + وَمَنِ اتَّبَعَ مِنْهُمْ عَلَى دُعْوَةِ النَّبِيِّ الْفَاسِقِ الْقَائِمِ فِي بَنِي الْعَلَيْصِ بْنِ خَنْفَصَ بْنِ عَدَى بْنِ جَنَابٍ (جَبَابٌ L.) مِنْ كُلِّ الَّذِي أَحْرَقَ (أَخْرَفَ L.) فِي وَقْعَتِهِ مِنْ طُفْجَمْ (Codd. unp.) وَصَاحِبِ الرِّزْجِ الْقَائِمِ بِالْبَصَرَةِ لَعْنَهُ اللَّهُ وَكَلَاهُمَا ادْعَى أَنَّهُ عَلَوَى وَهُمَا كاذبان في ذلك Among those who imitated his example in claiming prophecy was the scoundrel who arose among the Banū ‘l-‘Uleis b. Dām-dām b. ‘Adī b. Janāb of the Kelb (and) who was burned in his battle with (9) Tugj, also the leader of the Zenj who rose in Kūfa,—Allah curse him! They both pretended to be ‘Alides and they were both liars in this claim.” See Comm.

³ L. Br. “the ancients.”—Ed. Y. “اَوْلَاتُكَ” “those,” does not seem to convey a proper meaning.

⁴ المَكْنَى بِأَبِي خَرَاشٍ + “with the Kunya Abū Khirāsh.”

⁵ Om. here and add after “Asad b. ‘Abdallah.”—+ “in Khorāsān.”

⁶ عَزْ وَجْلَ وَغَضِبَةٌ + “and his anger.”

⁷ L. om. “Allah.”—L. Br. + “to whom the Sabā’iyya trace their origin.”

⁸ + لَهُ “to him.”

art he!" He asked them "Who is he?" and they answered "Thou art Allah." 'Ali, however, took the matter very seriously and gave orders to kindle a fire and he burned them in it. While they were being thrown into the fire, they started shouting: "Now we feel certain that he is 'Allah. For none but Allah punishes by fire."¹ Regarding this (incident) he² said:

[Rajaz] "When I saw that the matter became an illegal matter,

I kindled a fire and called Kanbar."

By Kanbar he refers to his slave, the same who was charged with throwing them* into the fire.⁴—Let us seek refuge in Allah from being led into temptation through a created being and a created being from being led into temptation through us, be it in a great or small (thing). For the temptation of Abū 'l-Hasan (i. e. 'Ali) in the midst of his followers is like the temptation of 'Isa⁵ in the midst of his followers, the Apostles.

* This sect still subsists today, (nay), is even increasing and embraces large numbers. They are called the 'Ulyāniyya.⁶ One of them was Ishāk b. Muhammed an-Nakha'i (of the Banū an-Nakha'), al-Aḥmar (the Red), of Kūfa, who was one of their dogmatists. He wrote a book on this subject under the title "as-Sirāt" (the Path). He was refuted⁷ by al-Bhnkī (?)⁸ and al-Fayyād⁹ as regards (his views) mentioned above.¹⁰ *They maintain that Muhammed is the Apostle of 'Ali.

¹ Br. أنت أنتك; L. أنتك "that thou art."

² + عالى الله عن كفرهم "Allah is exalted above their unbelief."

³ يقول على "Ali."

⁴ Om.

⁵ Ed. Y. + صلى الله عليه وسلم, the formula otherwise used only after the mention of the Prophet.—L. Br. the same formula after "the Apostles."

⁶ + Says Abū Muhammed.

⁷ Br. العلبانية. See Comm.

⁸ Ed. Y. نقض عليه (refuter, Dozy). L. بقصة, Br. بقصة, probably meant نقض.

⁹ Ed. Y. here and later البهتكي; Br. twice البهتكي. L. here النهيكتي, later البهتكي. Mas'ūdi, *Mu'raj ad-Dahab*, iii, 265.

¹⁰ Om.—+ b. 'Ali.

A group of Shi'ites, known as the *Muhammadiyya*, maintains¹ that Muhammad is Allah,—but Allah is exalted above their unbelief. To these belonged al-Bhnf and al-Fayyād * b. 'Ali.² The latter composed a book on this topic, which he called "al-Kustās"³ (the Balance). His father was the well-known Kātib, who first occupied this post under 'Abdallah b. Kandāj, when the latter was Wāli,⁴ then⁵ under the Commander of the Faithful, al-Mu'tadid.⁶ It was with reference to him that al-Buhturī composed the well-known⁷ poem, of which the beginning runs thus:

[Kliafif] Far from the inhabitant⁸ of Guweir⁹ is
 [his (present) place of visitation].¹⁰
 The (long) travels have emaciated him. But¹¹
 [Allah is his patron].¹²

[187] The said al-Fayyād,—Allah curse him!—was killed by al-Kāsim b. 'Abdallah¹³ b. Suleimān b. Wahb, because he was among those who denounced the latter in the days of al-Mu'tadid. The story^{*} is well known.

¹ In L. Br. corrupt probably owing to a homoiotetton: ويقولون و يقولون ان من صلاة (صلوة) الشيعة ايضا يقولون ان محمدًا ويقولون ان [محمدًا رسول على] و من صلاة الشيعة ايضا [ان] يقولون ان محمدًا Read the latters ذكرنا آنفا وهو الفياض بن علي بن محمد بن +

² Om.—+ al-Fayyād b. 'Ali b. Muhammed b. al-Fayyād.

³ Ed. Br. القسطاطر L.; القسطاطص Y.; (sic).

⁴ Ed. Br. "الجَرِير" over Mesopotamia."

⁵ "he was Kātib." كتب +

⁶ L. om. + Om.

⁷ L. Br. ساكنى "inhabitants." Buhturī, *Divān* (ed. Constantinople, 1800 H.) ii, 86 as Ed.

⁸ Ed. Y. L. —Br. and Buhturī as above.

⁹ Ed. Y. L. مَزَارَة (pronounce مَزَارُه). مَزَارُه = جَارَه.

¹⁰ Ed. Y. L. and Buht. مَزَارَة (pronounce مَزَارُه).

¹¹ Ed. and Codd. و Buht. ف.

¹² Ed. Y. L. and Buht. حَارَه.

¹³ 'Ubeidallah.

Another section believed in the divinity of Adam and the prophets¹ after him, prophet after prophet, down to Muhammed, then in the divinity of 'Ali, then in the divinity of al-Hasan, then² al-Husein, [then 'Ali b. al-Husein];³ then Muhammed b. 'Ali, then Ja'far b. Muhammed, and here they stopped. The Khattâbiyya one day publicly proclaimed this belief in Kûfa, when 'Isa b. Mûsa b. Muhammed b. Ali b. 'Abdallah b. al-'Abbâs was Wâli.⁴ They came out in the middle of the day in large crowds, attired in belts and cloaks like pilgrims, and shouting at the top of their voices: "With thee, o Ja'far! with thee, o Ja'far!" Ibn 'Ayâsh and others say: "It is, as if I saw them (as they were) that day." 'Isa b. Mûsa encountered them and they fought against him.⁵ But he killed them and exterminated them.

Then another section enlarged upon the above-mentioned doctrine and believed in the divinity of Muhammed b. Ismâ'il b. Ja'far b. Muhammed. These were the *Karmatians*. Among the latter were some who believed in the divinity of **Abû Sa'id al-Hasan b. Bahrdm al-Jannabi*⁶ and his sons after him. *Some of them believed in the divinity⁷ of *Abû'l-Kâsim an-Najjar*, who rose in Yemen in the lands of the Banû Hamdân and was called al-Mansûr.⁸

المشهورة—التبين^١ L. Br. om. by oversight.

بـالـاهـيـة^٢ + Here and before each following name + بالاهية .

^٣ Ed. om. ^٤ + "of Kûfa." ^٥ + "Abû Bekr."

ابـي سـعـيدـ الـحـسـنـ بـنـ سـعـيدـ الـجـبـائـيـ (الـحـمـائـيـ) . See Comm.

"L. Br. instead of وبالاهية كسر الاصفهاني وبالاهية and in the divinity of Ksr (?) of Isfahân and in the divinity."

وكان يكتمن اسمه لعنة الله وقيل ان اسمه الحسين بن فرج +
بن حوشب (خوشب Codd.) وكان كوف الدار وطائفة قال
بالاهية على بن الفضل (المفضل possibly) بن يزيد مولىبني
زياد المنسب الى ابى سفيان القائم بالجند وببلاد ذى مناخ
"He—Allah curse him!—used to conceal his name. They say, his name was al-Husein b. Faraj b. Haushab. His residence was in Kûfa. Another group

Another section of them believed in the divinity of 'Ubeidallah, then of those of his descendants who ruled after him until this day.

One group believed in the divinity of *Abū'l-Khaṭṭāb* Muhammed b. Abī Zeinab, a client of the Banū Asad in Kūfa. Their number grew so large that it exceeded the thousands. They said: "he¹ is a god, and Ja'far b. Muhammed is a god. But *Abū'l-Khaṭṭāb* is greater than the other." They used to say²: "all the descendants of al-Hasan [and al-Husein]³ are the sons and favorites⁴ of Allah." They believed that they would not die, but would be lifted up to heaven. The Sheikh whom you see (now), affected the likeness with this one before the people.⁵

Then one group of them believed in the divinity of *Mu'amar*, a corndeleader in Kūfa, whom they worshipped. *He was one of the followers of *Abū'l-Khaṭṭāb*, may Allah curse them all!⁶

Another group believed in the divinity of *al-Husein*⁷ b. Mansūr [*al-Hallāj*]⁸, a dresser of cotton, who was crucified in Bagdad through the efforts of the Vizier *Hāmid* b. al-'Abbās,—may Allah have mercy on him!—in the days of *al-Muktadir*.

Another group believed in the divinity of Muhammed b. 'Alī b. *ash-Shalmagān*,⁹ the *Kātib*,¹⁰ who was killed in Bagdad in

believed in the divinity of 'Alī b. al-Faḍl b. Yazid, a client of the Banū Ziyād, who traced his genealogy to *Abū Sufyān*, who rose in Janad and in the lands of the *Du-Manākh* in Yemen. Another group believed in the divinity of *al-Bawārī*, who rose in Sawād."

¹ هَذَا "this one." ² أَنْ + "that."

³ Ed. and Codd. om. See Comm.

⁴ Om. وَأَحْبَابُهُ.

⁵ تَشَبَّهَ (Br. شَهَدَ, L. unp.) عَلَى النَّاسِ بِذَلِكَ (بهذا) الشِّيْخُ "the mad Sheikh."—The translation of this phrase is not certain. See Comm.

⁶ Om.

⁷ Ed. Y. al-Hasan.

⁸ Ed. Y. om.

⁹ + *Ibn*.

¹⁰ Ed. A. السَّلْمَعَانِ لِي, scratched out, L. Br. here and later الشَّلْمَعَانِ. See Comm.

¹¹ + (Br. unp.) المَعْرُوفُ بِابْنِ الْفَرَاقِ "known as *Ibn al-Farākid*." See Comm.

the days of ar-Rādi. *He ordered those of his followers who were of higher attainments to have criminal intercourse with him,¹ so as to make the Light penetrate into him.

All these sects advocate the communism of wives.²

Another group of them believed in the divinity of *Shibāsh*,³ who is still alive and resides⁴ in Basra in our own time.

Another group of them believed in the divinity of *Abū Muslim* as-Sirāj. *Then one group of these believed⁵ in the divinity of⁶ *al-Mukanna'* al-A'war (the Blind), the fuller, who arose⁷ to revenge *Abū Muslim*. *The name of this fuller was Hāshim.⁸ He was killed—may Allah curse him!—in the days of *al-Mansūr*.

The Rawandiyā⁹ believed in the divinity of *Abū Ja'far*¹⁰ *al-Mansūr*. They professed it publicly. *But *al-Mansūr* came out and killed them and wiped them out.¹¹

“وَكَانَ يَامِرُ اتَّبَاعَهُ بِأَنْ يَنْكُحُ الْأَفْضَلَ مِنْهُمُ الْأَدْنَى” “He used to order his followers that the more excellent one of them should have criminal intercourse with the inferior one.” This is most probably correct.

وممَّن قُتِلَ عَلَى القُولِ بِالْأَهْلِيَّةِ هَذَا الْمُلْعُونُ ابْنُ الشَّلْمَاجَانِ +¹² حينئذ الْوَزِيرُ الْخَسِينُ بْنُ عَبِيدِ اللَّهِ بْنُ سَلِيمَانَ بْنُ وَهْبٍ أَبْنُ سَعِيدِ الْمِسْتَى عَبِيدِ الدُّوَلَةِ الْمُلْقَبُ بِابْنِ الْجَمَالِ (الْحَمَالِ). Codd. (الْحَمَالِ). وَكَانَتْ اُمَّةُ بَنْتِ الْوَزِيرِ الْخَسِينِ بْنِ الْجَرَاحِ (مُخْلِدٌ Br. +) وَقُتِلَ مَعَهُ عَلَى ذَلِكِ ابْنِ ابْنِ ابْنِ عَوْنَ (الْكَاتِبُ + Br.) أَمْرٌ بِقَتْلِهِمَا عَلَى ذَلِكِ “الرَّاضِي” “Among those who were then killed because they believed in the divinity of this cursed *Ibn ash-Shalmağan* was the Vizier *al-Husein b. 'Ubeidallah b. Suleimān b. Wahb b. Sa'id*, called 'Amīd ad-Duula (Pillar of the Dynasty), with the nickname *Abū'l Jamāl* (Father of Elegance). His mother was the daughter of the Vizier *al-Husein b. al-Jarāḥ* (Br. *Mkhld*).—Together with him was killed for the same reason *Ibn Abī 'Aun* (Br. + the Kātib). Ar-Rāqī ordered their execution on account of it.”

¹ Ed. Y. شباش; L. Br. unp. The pronunciation is uncertain.

² Ed. misprint المغيم. ³ Only ثم.

⁴ + Hāshim.

⁵ + “in Merv.”

⁸ Om.

⁶ Ed. Y. الرَّوَبِدِيَّةُ L. Br., the Rovbediyah. See Comm.

¹⁰ + “the Commander of the Faithful.”

فَخَرَجَ إِلَيْهِمْ بِنَفْسِهِ وَأَمْرَ بِقَتْلِهِمْ فَقُتِلُوا كُلُّهُمْ إِلَى لَعْنَةِ اللَّهِ

“he himself came out and ordered to kill them. They were all killed, in addition to the curse of Allah.”

Another group of them believed in the divinity of 'Abdallah b. al-Hārith¹ of the Banū Kinda² in Kūfa, whom they worshipped. He believed in the Transmigration of Souls. He imposed upon them³ seventeen⁴ prayers (every) day and night,⁵ each prayer having fifteen⁶ "bows." Later, however, [188], one of the dogmatists of the Sufriyya having argued with him and having clearly put forth the arguments for the (true) religion,⁷ he became a Muslim⁸ and his Islam was sound. He renounced all the beliefs he had held previously. He informed his followers of it⁹ and openly showed his repentance.¹⁰ Thereupon all his followers¹¹ who had worshipped him and had professed his divinity withdrew from him. They cursed him and deserted him,¹² and they all returned to the belief in the Imāmate of 'Abdallah b. Mu'awiya b. 'Abdallah b. Ja'far b. Abī Tālib.¹³ 'Abdallah b. al-Hārith, however, persevered¹⁴ in Islam and¹⁵ in the doctrine of the Sufriyya till he died. * His party is still known today as the *Kharbiyya*.¹⁶

To the *Sabā'iyya*,¹⁷ who profess the divinity of 'Alī, belongs a party¹⁸ known as the *Nušeiriyya*.¹⁹ They got hold in our own

¹ L. and Ed. ii, 115 الحَرْث (with a soft under the line). Br. الحُرْث. ² Ed. Y. here and later الحَرْب. See Comm.

³ صَلِيْبَةٌ + "by descent."

⁴ على أَقْبَاعِهِم "upon his followers."

⁵ Ed. Y. 19. See Comm.

⁶ L. every day (Br. + and night).

⁷ خَمْسَةُ عَشَرَةً Ed. Y. خَمْسَةُ عَشَرَةً .

⁸ "the religion of Islam."

⁹ بِأَخْتِيَارِهِ Ed. Y. بِأَخْتِيَارِهِ .

¹⁰ Om.

¹¹ الَّذِينَ كَانُوا يَعْبُدُونَهُ وَيَقْرُرُونَ بِالاَهْيَةِ فَكَلَّ بُوْهٌ وَقَبَرُوْهُ مِنْهُ وَلَعْنَوْهُ .

¹² Om. probably owing to homoioteleuton.

¹³ وَهُمْ إِلَى الْيَوْمِ يَعْرُفُونَ بِالْحَرْبِدَةِ after "Ja'far b. Abī Talib." (sic)

¹⁴ Ed. Y. السَّبَايِّدَةُ ; L. Br. السَّبَايِّدَةُ . See Comm.

¹⁵ Ed. misprint طَائِفَةٌ instead of طَائِفَةٌ .

¹⁶ Ed. Y. النَّصِيرِيَّةُ ; L. Br. A. البَصْرِيَّةُ . See Comm.

time *of the army of Urdunn in Palestine and especially of the city of Tiberias.¹ It is one of their tenets to curse² Fátima, the daughter of the Apostle of Allah, and to curse al-Hasan and al-Husein, the sons of ‘Alí, to denounce them in a most detestable manner,³ to charge them with every possible calamity and to assert positively that she and her two sons—may Allah be pleased with them and curse their haters!—were devils who assumed the shape of human beings.⁴ As regards their opinion about ‘Abderráhman⁵ b. Muljam al-Murádi (of the Banú Murád),⁶ the murderer of ‘Alí—may Allah be pleased with him⁷ and may the curse of Allah (rest) upon Ibn Muljam!—these (people) maintain *that ‘Abderráhman b. Muljam al-Murádi⁸ is the most excellent of all the people of the earth and the most honored⁹ of them in the future world, because he purified¹⁰ the spirit of the Deity from what had stuck to it of the darkness and turbidity¹¹ of the body. Marvel ye at this madness and ask ye of Allah deliverance from the affliction of this and the future world, for it is in his hands, not in anyone else's. May Allah make our portion of it most plentiful!

*Know ye that among all those that count themselves to the religion of Islam, while adhering to these abominable heterodoxies,¹²

على مدينة الطبرية بالشام وعلى جمهور جند الأردن¹.

² ومن قولهم الخبيث سب², “one of their disgraceful tenets is the denouncing.” Instead of لـ. blank.

³ وحسدهم فامر ع المس³. (sic).

⁴ Instead of الجن لـ. Br. الحسن الانسان.

⁵ L. ‘Abdallah. ⁶ Om.

⁷ Ed. Y. + عن على ^{عَلَى} “with ‘Alí.” It is a gloss to ^{عَنْ} which crept into the text.

⁸ Only أَنْدَى “that he.”

⁹ A. اكْرَهُهُمْ “the most repugnant.” Y. is scratched out and م substituted.

¹⁰ يخلص (imperfect form).

¹¹ Br. erroneously (فَكَذَّبُوهُ = كَذَّبُوهُ). instead of وَكَذَّبُوهُ.

واعلموا ان (ان) كل مَن ينتهي الى دين¹¹ [“] الاسلام هذه الكفرات الفاحشة التي ذكرنا من دعوى الربوبية [“] Know ye that all those who reckon these abominable heterodoxies mentioned before, viz., the claim of Divinity, to the religion of Islam.”

—that their (vivifying) element are only the Shi'ites¹ and Sūfis.² For there are people among the Sūfis who maintain³ that he who has attained the knowledge of God is exempt from the (religious) precepts.⁴ Some of them add⁵: “and becomes united with the Almighty.” We have been told that there is now in Nīsābūr in our own age a man, whose Kunya is Abū Sa'īd Abū'l-Kheir—thus (two Kunyas) together⁶—belonging to the Sūfis. Sometime he dresses himself in wool⁷, another time he dresses himself in silk⁸ which is forbidden to men. Now he prays thousand “bows” on one day, now⁹ he recites neither the obligatory nor the voluntary prayer. This is pure apostasy. Let us seek refuge in Allah from error !

C. The Imāmate of the 'Alides.

[Printed Edition (=Ed.) IV, pp. 92–94; Codex Leyden (=L.) II, fol. 87a ff. Codex British Museum (=Br.) II, fol. 22^b ff. The variants quoted anonymously are taken from L. and Br. and, if not otherwise stated, identical in both.]

Those who maintain that the Imāmate is only permissible in the descendants of 'Alī are divided into two parties.

One party maintains that the Apostle of Allah put down a written statement concerning 'Alī, viz. that he was to be the

¹ الشَّنِيعُ “the detestable.” Read التَّشِيعُ “Shi'ism.”

² الْكُلْتَنَىٰ + المَذَهَبُ الصَّوْفِيَّةُ “the doctrine of the Sūfis.”
الْطَّائِفَتَيْنِ احْصَابُ التَّأْوِيلَاتِ وَخَرْجُونَ عَنْ ظَاهِرِ الْقُرْآنِ بِدَعَائِيهِمْ
الْفَاسِدَةُ “for both parties are advocates of (allegorical) interpretation
and of giving up the open meaning of the Koran through their corrupt
pretensions.”

³ وَمِنْ قَوْلِ بَعْضِ الصَّوْفِيَّةِ “one of the views of some Sūfis is.”

⁴ الْأَعْمَالُ الشَّرِعِيَّةُ “religious practices.”

⁵ زَادَ (instead of زَادَ).

⁶ هَكُذا كَنْيَتَانِ جَمْعُهُتَانِ (جَمْعُهُانِ L.) مَعًا “thus two Kunyas joined together.” — + L. حَنْفَيِ الْمَذَهَبِ “of the Hanafitic school.”

⁷ + L. الْخَسْنُ “coarse.” Br. erroneously الحَسْنُ “beautiful.”

⁸ الْصِّرْفُ “pure.”

⁹ L. وَيَوْمًا = وَيَوْمًا “and one day.”

Caliph after him, but the Companions after him¹ unanimously agreed upon doing wrong to 'Ali and upon keeping to themselves the statement of the Prophet. These are the so-called² *Rawâfiḍ*.

The other party says: The Prophet never put down a written statement concerning 'Ali. Yet he was the most excellent of men after the Apostle of Allah and worthier of the command³ than any of them. These are the *Zeidiyya*, who trace their origin to Zeid b. 'Alī b. al-Ḥusein b. 'Alī b. Abī Tālib.

Then the *Zeidiyya* fell asunder into several sections. One group said that⁴ the Companions did him wrong, and they declared those of the Companions who opposed him apostates. *These are the *Jāridiyya*.

Another group maintained that the Companions⁵ did not do him any wrong, but he was pleased to concede his rights to Abū Bekr and 'Omar, who consequently were Imāms of right guidance, some of them stopping at 'Othmān, while others observing a friendly attitude towards him. *A number of people mention⁶ that this was the doctrine⁷ of the *Fakīh al-Hasan* b. Sāliḥ b. Hayy al-Hamdanī (of the Banū Hamdān).⁸ Says Abū Muhammed: This is a mistake. *I have seen in the book of Hishām b. al-Hakam the Rāfidite of Kūfa⁹, known under the title [93] "al-Mizān" (the Balance), that he mentions al-Hasan b. Hayy and also (states) that his doctrine was that the Imāmate was permissible in all the descendants of Fihri b. Mālik. Says Abū Muhammed: This is the only thing which suits al-Hasan¹⁰ b. Hayy. For he was one of the Imāms of the (true) religion and Hishām b. al-Hakam knew him better than those who attribute to him other views. Hishām was his neighbor in Kūfa and

¹ وَهُوَ لَا يَمْلأُ مَوْتَهُ "after his death."

² بِالخِلَافَةِ "the caliphate." ³ كُلٌّ "all."

⁴ Om., probably owing to homoioteleuton.

⁵ وَذَكَرَ بَعْضُهُمْ يَأْلَفُ فِي الْمَقَالَاتِ "Some of those who write on heterodox views." See Comm.

⁶ قَوْلٍ " + " al-Kūfi."

⁷ لَأْنَ هَشَامَ بْنَ الْحَكَمَ عَمِيدَ الرَّافِضَةِ قَالَ فِي كِتَابِهِ "for Hishām b. al-Hakam, the pillar of the Rawāfiḍ, says in his book."

⁸ + b. Sāliḥ.

knew him better than all other people, having reached his generation and having seen him personally. (Besides), al-Hasan b. Ḥayy¹—may Allah have mercy on him!—quotes² Mu'awiya and Ibn Zubeir as authorities, as is well known from his books³* as well as from the traditions of those who received traditions from him.⁴

⁵All the *Zeidiyya* unanimously agree that the Imāmate is permissible in all the descendants of 'Alī, as far as they go forth appealing to the Book and the Sunna and carrying^(?)⁶ a sword with them.

The *Rawāfiḍ* maintain that the Imāmate is due to 'Alī himself⁷ on account of a written statement concerning him. Then it (passes over) to al-Hasan, then to al-Husein—they claim another written statement of the Prophet concerning these two, after their father,—then to 'Alī b. al-Husein by reason of the saying of Allah: “And those who are related by blood are the nearest of kin to each other, according to the Book of Allah.”⁸ Therefore, they say, have the descendants of al-Husein⁹ better claims than [the sons of]¹⁰ his brother. Then (the Imāmate passes over) to Muhammed b. 'Alī b. al-Husein, then to Ja'far b. Muhammed b. 'Alī b. al-Husein. This is the doctrine of all their dogmatists, viz. Hishām b. al-Ḥakam, Hishām al-Juwālik̄, Dāwud al-Iwārī,¹¹ Dāwud ar-Rakk̄, 'Alī b. Mansūr, 'Alī b. Mītām,¹² Abū 'Alī *ash-Shakkāk*,¹³ the pupil of Hishām b. al-Ḥakam, Muhammed b. Ja'far *b. an-Nu'mān¹⁴ Sheitān at-Tāk,¹⁵ Abū Mālik¹⁶ of Hadramaut and others.

¹ Sāliḥ.

² فِي كَثِيرٍ مِن مَسَائِلِهِ + “in many of his religious responsa.”

³ Singular.

⁴ بِرَوَايَاتِ الثُّقَاتِ “through the traditions of reliable authorities.”

⁵ + Says Abū Muhammed.

⁶ Ed. وَحْنَ هَفْ وَهَلْ ل. وَجْب سَلْ (sic). Br. I cannot make out what this reading means. I propose وَهَمْل “and carry.”

⁷ Om.

⁸ Koran VIII, 76.—L. Br. om. اللَّهُ.

⁹ L. al-Hasan.

¹⁰ Ed. om. بَنِي.

¹¹ الْجَوَارِي.

¹² Ed. هَيْتَمْ . See Comm.

¹³ Ed. Br. السَّكَانْ . See Comm.

¹⁴ Om.—+ المعْرُوفُ بـ “known as.”

¹⁵ Ed. and Codd. written مَلِكْ .

The Rawâfid then disagreed after the death of those ('Alides) mentioned above, (especially) after the death of Ja'far b. Muhammed. One party assigned the Imâmate to his son Ismâ'il b. Ja'far.¹ Another party assigned the Imâmate to his son Muhammed b. Ja'far. *But these are few.² *Still another party maintained that Ja'far was alive and that he has not died.³

The bulk of the Rawâfid, however, assign the Imâmate to his son Mûsa b. Ja'far, then 'Ali b. Mûsa, then Muhammed b. 'Ali b. Mûsa, *then 'Ali b. Muhammed b. 'Ali b. Mûsa,⁴ then Al-Hasan b. 'Ali.⁵ This al-Hasan died without offspring and they were (consequently) divided into several sections. The bulk of them firmly assert that a male child was born to al-Hasan *b. 'Ali,⁶ but he hid him. Other people, however, maintain that he was born after al-Hasan's death from a slave girl of his by the name of Sakîl, *and this is the view most commonly accepted.⁷ Some of them however say: no, from a slave girl of his by the name of Narjis. Still others say: no, but from a slave girl of his by the name of Sausan. But the most probable⁸ is that her name was Sakîl. For this Sakîl pretended *to be with child after al-Hasan b. 'Ali her master,⁹ and his estate remained for this reason unsettled for seven years, being contested by his brother Ja'far b. 'Ali.¹⁰ A number of leading statesmen took her part, while others took Ja'far's part. Then her pretension¹¹ of pregnancy¹² exploded and was annihilated, and Ja'far his brother took possession of the estate. *The death of this al-Hasan took

وادعوا انه حي لم يمت والذى لا شك فيه انه مات في حياة +
 ١ (حيات) Codd. "They claimed that he was alive, and that he never died. But there is no doubt that he died during the lifetime of his father. He was his eldest son."

¹ Br. om.

² L. om. owing to homoioteleuton.

⁴ Om.

⁵ Muhammed.

⁶ Om.

⁷ Om.

⁸ والأشهر عندهم "and the most commonly accepted among them."

⁹ اذها حامل اذ مات سيدها الحسن .

¹⁰ وكان موت الحسن هذا سنة ستين وما تئين بعشر من زلزال +

"The death of this al-Hasan took place in 260 in Surr man Ra'd."

¹¹ ما ادعته من الحمل .

place in 260.¹ But the contest of the Rawâfidh about this Sakîl and her claims still grew (worse), until al-Mu'tadid imprisoned her,² twenty-odd years after the death of her master. She had been accused³ of living in the house of al-Hasan b. Ja'far an-Nûbakht⁴ [94], the Kâtib,⁵ and she was (actually) found there and then transported to the castle of al-Mu'tadid, where she remained until she died in the days of al-Mukâdir. But they (the Rawâfidh) are still waiting for a lost object⁶ since 180⁷ years.

There existed in olden times a party which is now extinct, whose head was al-Mukhtâr b. Abî 'Ubeid,⁸ (also) Keisân Abû 'Omra⁹ and others. They were of the opinion that after al-Husein¹⁰ the Imâm was his brother Muhammed, known as Ibn al-Hanafiyya. To this party¹¹ belonged as-Sayyid¹² al-Himyari and Kuṭayyir 'Azza, the two poets. They maintained that Muhammed b. al-Hanafiyya was alive in the mountains of Radwâ.

¹ Om. here.

² كسبها "acquired her."

³ Ed. غير does not seem to convey a proper sense. L. Br. غمز:

See Comm.

⁴ Unpointed.

⁵ الْمُلَقَّبُ بِمِزْمَالَةٍ + "with the nickname Mîzmalâ (?)".

⁶ Om. ضالة.

⁷ مذ مائة عام ونحيف وثمانين عاماً "since hundred and eighty-odd years." See Introduction, p. 19.—+ لايدرؤن في أي كنيف غرق "They do not know in which privy he may have sunk." Ed. in all probability intentionally omitted.

⁸ التّقْفَى + "of the Banû Takîfa."

⁹ المكنى بابي عمرة المكنى بيان وغيرهم Ed. incorrectly; L. Br. ابا المكنى بيان is a gloss to the first "clearly" which crept into the text. Instead of the dual is probably due to the ignorance of the copyist, who took the gloss for a new name.

¹⁰ L. al-Hasan. Br. الحسن على (sic).

¹¹ الطّبقة "lot."

¹² + "b. Ismâ'îl."

They were addicted to eccentric ideas, for whose description¹ volumes would not suffice.²

Says Abū Muhammed: The pillar of all these parties in their arguments are interpolated and forged traditions, the production of which is not beyond the reach of those who have neither religion nor shame.

D. Synopsis of the Tenets of the Shi'ites.

[Codex Leyden (=L.) II, fol. 162^b; Codex British Museum (=Br.) II, 125^b.]

تمثيل أقوال الشيعة، قالت الشيعة على أفضلي اصحاب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وأحقهم بالامامة فلما عزموا على ذلك وحققه قال قائل منهم فإذا الامر كذلك فالآمة خطئه بتقديمها ابا بكر ثم عمر ثم عثمان فجبن عن ذلك الحسن بن حنّي وجمهور الزيدية وانصرفوا عن ذلك الشغب واقتصر سائر الشيعة فلما حققوا خطأ الآمة كلها قال قائل منهم فقد ظلموا إذن وفسقوا وكفروا إذ قد ينعوا بما لا يحل ودين الله عز وجل لا يحل أخذده عن فساق ولا عن كفار فنفر من هذا الشعب سليمان بن جرير والثمار واصحابهما واقتصر سائر الشيعة فلما عزموا على ذلك وحققه قال قائل منهم فإذا ذلك فعل قد كفر اذا ايد اهل الكفر وأعان على إبطال الدين

¹ "الكثيرة many."

ولقد ذكر انه قيل للسيد الحميري لعنة الله من معك على ² "هذا المذهب فقال إسکاف بالری as-Sayyid al-Himyari—Allah curse him!—was once asked: "who is thy associate in this doctrine?" and he answered: "a cobbler in Rai (Teheran)." See Comm.

اَذْ لَمْ يَكُشِّفْ وَجْهَهُ فَهُوَ وَهُمْ سَوَاءٌ فَنَفَرَتْ الشِّعْيَةُ جَمِيلَةً مِنْ
 هَذَا الشِّعْبَ وَاتَّخَمَهُ ابْوَ كَامِلَ وَمَنِ اتَّبَعَهُ فَلِمَا حَقَّقُوا ذَلِكَ قَالَ
 قَاتِلُهُمْ فَإِذَا الْاَمْرُ كَذَلِكَ فَمِنْهُمْ مَنْ حَقَّقَهُ ذَلِكَ قَاتِلُ
 لَكُلِّ اَمْرٍ بَلْ مِنْهُمْ فَإِذَا الْاَمْرُ كَذَلِكَ فَمِنْهُمْ مَنْ حَقَّقَهُ
 ذَلِكَ اَذْ لَمْ يَبْيَّنْ الْاَمْرَ يَقْطَعَ الْعُدُورَ بِهِ وَقَالَ قَاتِلُهُمْ آخَرُ بَلْ
 جَبَرِيلُ هُوَ الظَّالِمُ اَذْ عَدَا بِالنَّبِيَّةِ عَنْ عَلَىٰ الْحَمْدِ، قَالَ ابْوَ
 حَمْدٍ مَا هُمْ إِلَّا مُسْتَخْفَفُونَ مُسْتَهْزَءُونَ وَنَعْوَدُ بِاللَّهِ مِنَ الْفَضَالِ.

Synopsis of the Tenets of the Shi'ites.

The Shi'ites say: 'Alī is the most excellent of the Companions of the Apostle of Allah and worthier of the Imāmate than any of them. This having been settled and established, one of them said: If the matter be such, then the nation committed a sin by nominating Abū Bekr, then 'Omar, then 'Othmān. Al-Hasan b. Ḥayy¹ and the bulk of the Zeidiyya shrank from this (consequence) and turned aside from this narrow pass, while the rest of the Shi'ites rushed into it. The sinfulness of the whole nation having been established, one of them said: If so, then they (i. e. the Companions who submitted to those nominated) acted wrongly, and became irreligious and apostates,² since they professed something that is forbidden, and it is therefore not allowed to receive the religion of Allah from irreligious men or apostates. Suleimān b. Jarīr³, at-Tammar⁴ and their followers flee from this narrow pass, while the rest of the Shi'ites rush into it. This having been settled and established, one of them said: If this be so, then 'Alī also *became an apostate,⁵ having assisted the adherents of apostasy and having contributed towards the annihilation of religion, since he did not uncover

¹ Codd. حَمَيْ.

² Br. om. وَكَفَرُوا (purposely).

³ Codd. الْحَرَرِيرِ.

⁴ Codd. "Ibn at-Tammār."

⁵ Br. om. See p. 55.

his face; he and they are therefore alike. All the Shi'ites flee from this narrow pass, while Abū Kāmil and those that follow him rush into it. This having been established, one of them said: *If the matter be such, then Muhammed is the guilty one who set free all these (contentions) by not having explained the matter (so as) to cut down all pretexts regarding it.¹ Another one of them said: Surely, Jibrīl alone is guilty, because he passed with the prophecy from 'Alī to Muhammed.

Says Abū Muhammed: They do nothing but show contempt and make fun (of Allah). Let us seek refuge in Allah from error!

[The Commentary will follow in the next number of this Journal.]

¹ L. om. owing to homoioteleuton.

*Contributions from the Jāimīniya Brāhmaṇa to the history
of the Brāhmaṇa literature.*—By HANNS OERTEL, Pro-
fessor in Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

Sixth Series¹: The story of Uśanas Kāvya, the three-headed Gandhar-
van, and Indra.

1. In the twelfth volume of the *Abhandlungen für die Kunde
des Morgenlandes*, Caland translated,² among other stories from
the Būdhyāna Sūtra, the tale of Uśanas Kāvya, Indra, and
the three-headed Gandharvan. To his kindness I also owe a
transcript of the Sanskrit text (rather poorly preserved in the
ms.). No parallel text, except that given below, seems to

¹ Series I appeared in this *Journal*, xviii, p. 15; Series II, *ibid.* xix, p. 97; Series III in *Actes du onzième Congrès International des Orientalistes*, Paris, 1897, vol. i (1899), p. 225; Series IV in this *Journal*, xxiii, p. 325; Series V, *ibid.* xxvi, pp. 176 and 306.

² *Abh. f. d. Kund. d. Morg.* xii (1903), No. 1, p. 26: 'Als Götter und Asuras den grossen Kampf kämpften, da trennten sich alle Geschöpfe in zwei Teile: die Partei der Götter wählten einige, die der Asuras andere. Bṛhaspati war der Götter, und Uśanah Kāvya der Asuras Opferpriester: sowohl die Götter wie die Asuras hatten einen Brahman. Nun lieferten sie einander zahllose Kämpfe, ohne dass die eine Partei die andere besiegen konnte. Keines von den beiden Heeren war bekannt mit dem, was geschehen sollte. Der Gandharva Sūryavarcāḥ aber war wohl damit bekannt. Mit dessen Gattin nun stand Indra in Liebesbezie-
hung. Er sprach zu ihr: "Du Schöne, frage du den Gandharva, weshalb es zwischen Göttern und Asuras jetzt nicht zu einer Entscheidung kom-
men kann." "Gut," so sprach sie, "komm' auch du morgen." Nun hatte er sich im Meere einen goldenen Schiffspalast (?) gemacht. Da kam Indra herbei und, nachdem er sich in einem goldenen Sonnenstrahl verwandelt hatte, legte er sich in der Nähe des Schiffspavillons nieder. Als sie bemerkte, dass er angekommen, fragte sie: "Du Schöner, sage du, weshalb es jetzt zwischen Göttern und Asuras nicht zu einer Entschei-
dung kommen kann." "Nicht zu laut," sagte jener, "Ohren hat ja das Schiff (?); sowohl die Götter wie die Asuras haben einen Brahman." Als er diese Worte hörte, nahm Indra die leuchtende Gestalt des Hari an. Ihn erblickend sprach jener: "O Mächtiger, o Herr, jene, an deren Seite Hari sich befindet, die werden siegen." Indra ging davon und beredete den Uśanah Kāvya zum Übergehen durch das Versprechen, dass er eine Tochter des Siegers und vier Wunschküsse bekommen werde (cf. PB. vii. 5. 20); dadurch überredet verliess er die Asuras und trat zu den Göttern über.'

occur in the Brähmaṇas. Our story substantially forms the frame-work of the seventy-sixth chapter of the first book¹ of the Mahābhārata, but it is greatly changed by the addition of many romantic details. The Vedic allusions to the legend are discussed by Geldner (*Ved. Stud.* ii, 166 ff.) and Pischel (*ibid.* p. 195).

2. JB. i. 125. devāsurāś² samyattā jyoñ³ na vyajayanta. bṛhaspatir devānām purohita ūśid uśanā⁴ kāvya 'surāñām. tad yad evā 'vastād brahmā 'kriyata tat parastād akriyata tat samānam brahma na vyajayata. teśūm ha triśīrṣā gandharvo vijayasyā⁵ 'vet. sa ṭheṣṭur⁶ āsa.⁷ tasya⁸ hū 'psv antar⁹ nāunagaram pariplavam āsa. tad indro 'nvabuddhyata triśīrṣā vāi nāu vijayasya vede 'ti.¹⁰ tasya jāyām¹¹ upāucyat¹². etasyāi¹³ 'va vijayasya kāmāya tām abravīt pr̄echatat¹⁴ patim ya¹⁵ ime devāsurāś samyattā jyog abhūvan katara eśūm¹⁶ jesyanti¹⁷ 'ti. tad dhāi 'va sampadamānū¹⁸ 'vājagāma. sa ha tad eva nāumanya¹⁹ upaśišleṣa²⁰²¹ jalāyukā vā trṇakain²² vā²³ bhūtvā. se 'yam patim papracch²⁴ ya ime devāsurāś²⁵ samyattā jyog abhūvan katara²⁶ eśūm jesyanti²⁷ 'ti.

126. mo 'ccāir²⁸ iti ho 'vāca karṇī²⁹ vāi bhūmir iti. tad idam apy³⁰ etarhy³¹ āhur³² mo 'ccāih karṇī vāi bhūmir iti. ne 'ti ho 'vāca brūhy eve 'ti. sa ho 'vāca brāhmaṇāv imāu samaṁ vida-

¹ Cf. Geldner, *Ved. Stud.* ii, p. 167.

² B.C. devāssurā. ³ A. jyeñ.

⁴ So also Caland's ms. of the Bāudhāyana Sūtra; cf. Whitney, *Gr.* § 355 a, 416; Lanman, *Noun-Inflection*, p. 559, II.

⁵ A. B. pij-

⁶ A. eśā; B. heṣṭur; C. hoṣṭur. ⁷ A. sa. ⁸ A. -ā. ⁹ -ntañ.

¹⁰ A. di. ¹¹ C. mā-. ¹² A. pāuccad; B. apāuchcad; C. upāuchcad,

¹³ C. evas- ¹⁴ A. prachāyatāt. ¹⁵ A.B.C. yan

¹⁶ B.C. eśā.

¹⁷ All three mss. jyeṣyanti; see below, n. 25 and p. 83, n. 10. There is a bare possibility that the form is the product of a contamination of the roots ji and jyā; but, on the whole, it seems better to emend it.

¹⁸ So all three mss.

¹⁹ B.C. manva.

²⁰ A.B. upaśišveṣa; C. upaviśāśreṣṭha.

²¹ B. inserts triṇakam.

²² B. omits.

²³ A. devāssurās. ²⁴ A.C. karata.

²⁵ A.B. jyeṣy-; see above, note 17 and below, p. 83, note 10.

²⁶ A. moccer; B.C. mocāir. ²⁷ A. kapñtrini.

²⁸ A. avy. ²⁹ A. etasy. ³⁰ A. āhutiñ.

tur¹ bṛhaspatir ayam devesu² 'śanā kāvyo 'suresu. tāu yat kurnatas tat samam eva yacchati.³ yā itara āhutir juhoti⁴ tā⁵ itarāḥ. tūś sametya yathāyatham eva punar viparāyanti. taylor yatarān upasamesyati te jesyanti⁶ tad dhāi⁷ 've 'ndro 'nubuddhya śuko bhūtvo 'tpapāta. tam hā 'nvikṣya patantam uvāca yesām⁸ asūn haritavarnakah patati⁹ te jesyanti¹⁰ 'ti. sa ho 'śana-sam kāvyaṁ ījagāmā 'surenu.¹¹ tam ho 'vāca rse kam imām janām vardhayasy asmākanā vāi tvam asi vayaṁ vū tavā 'smān abhyupāvartasve 'ti. kathē¹² 'ti ho 'vāca kena mo 'pamantrayasa¹³ iti. yā imā virocanasya prāhlādeḥ kāmadughās¹⁴ tābhīr iti. tābhīr ha p r a t v [SV. ii. 27] ity eva pradudruvatuh.¹⁵ tāu¹⁶ hā¹⁷ 'surā anvavajahre.¹⁸ tāu hā 'nvājagmuś.¹⁹ sa ho 'vāca rse nu²⁰ vāi nāv ime 'surā agmann iti. sa vāi tathā kurv iti²¹ ho 'vāca yathā nāv ete nā 'nvāgacchān iti.²² tāu hāi 'tat pratipedāte.²³

127. Svāyudhalah pavate deva indūr aśastihā vrjanā²⁴ rakṣamāṇah | pitā devānām janitā sudakṣo viṣṭambho divo dharunah pṛthivīyā [SV.ii. 28] ity ā divo²⁵ viṣṭambham ucchiśriyatuh.²⁶ tam hāi²⁷ 'vā²⁸ 'surā nā²⁹ 'tlyuh. tāu³⁰ hā 'bhih kāmadughābhīr devān ījagmatuh.³¹ tāu hā³² 'gatāu mahayām cakrire³³ rsir³⁴ viprah puraśtā janānām ībhur³⁵ dhīra³⁶ usānā kāvyaena | sa cid viveda nihitām yad āśām apicayām guhyām nāmā³⁷ gonām³⁸ [SV. ii. 29] iti. tā etāl³⁹ paśavyā⁴⁰ reo 'va paśūn rundhe bahupaśur bhavaty etābhīr ṛgbhis tuṣṭuvānah.⁴¹ tāsv⁴² āuśanam. usānā vāi kāvyo devesv⁴³ amartyām gandharvalokam⁴⁴ īcchata. sa etat⁴⁵ sāmā 'paśyat tenā 'stuta tato vāi sa devesv amartyām gandharvalokam āśnuta⁴⁶ tad etal lokavit⁴⁷ sāmā 'śnute⁴⁸ devesv amartyām gandharvalokam etena⁴⁹ tuṣṭuvānah. yad usānā⁵⁰ kāvyo 'paśyat tasmād āuśanam ity ākhyāyate.⁵¹

¹ C. vividatu; B. vidatu. ² B.C. devesṭha. ³ yachchati.

⁴ B. -ta ; C. -tvā. ⁵ C. om. ⁶ All mss. jaṣyanti. ⁷ B.C. dhe.

⁸ B.C. eṣām. ⁹ A. patiti. ¹⁰ So all mss. ¹¹ C. -eṣṭa. ¹² C. tathe.

¹³ C. samajñayasa. ¹⁴ All mss. -ghāś.

¹⁵ A.B. praduduvatus; C. pratudravatus. ¹⁶ B. te ; C. to.

¹⁷ B.C. bhā. ¹⁸ B. avajah- : see note to translation.

¹⁹ A. nvājaṇmu ; B. nvājagmān ; C. nvājagāmas. ²⁰ B.C. na.

²¹ A.C. Iti ; B. ati. ²² All mss. iti. ²³ B.C. prativedāte.

²⁴ prajanā. ²⁵ divo. ²⁶ uchiś- ²⁷ B.C. bhāi. ²⁸ A. vātu.

²⁹ A. om. ³⁰ C. ū. ³¹ A. āñjag. ³² B.C. bhā. ³³ All mss. cakre.

³⁴ B.C. ruṣir. ³⁵ A. ḥ. ³⁶ A. iddhāhārā. ³⁷ B.C. -mo.

³⁸ A. nonām. ³⁹ A. etām. ⁴⁰ A. apaś-. ⁴¹ B.C. tuṣṭubhavānas.

⁴² C. tās tu. ⁴³ A. devaṣu. ⁴⁴ All mss. gandharvo lokam.

⁴⁵ B.C. etas. ⁴⁶ All mss. āśruta. ⁴⁷ C. lokamavit. ⁴⁸ A.B. śrute.

⁴⁹ A. ete ; B.C. eta. ⁵⁰ B.C. aśanā. ⁵¹ All mss. āyate.

3. Translation and Notes.

The gods and the Asuras, having joined in combat, for a long time could not gain a decisive victory. Br̄haspati was the chaplain (*purohita*) of the gods, Uśanas Kāvya of the Asuras. Now, what rite (*brahman*)¹ was performed forward [by the gods] that was performed backward² [by the Asuras]; that rite (*brahman*), being the same, did not gain a decisive victory.³ Of them a three-headed Gandharvan knew about the decisive victory. He was . . . He had, in the midst of the waters, a ship-town floating about. Now Indra was cognizant of the fact: 'The three-headed one knows about the decisive victory of both of us.' He liked to consort with his⁴ (the Gandharvan's) wife. For the sake of this same complete victory he said to her⁵: 'Ask [your] husband: "The gods and the Asuras who have for a long time been joined in combat—which of them will win?"' Agreeing⁶ to it she then undertook it.⁷ He then clung to the

¹ Cf. JUB. iv. 20. 1 f. = Kena Ūp. 14, where the *brahman* wins a complete victory for the gods (cf. Geldner, *Ved. Stud.* iii, p. 128).

² On such reversals in the sacrifice cf. Hillebrandt, *Ritualliteratur*, p. 170, 47 with note 12, and p. 175, 1; Caland, ZDMG. liii (1899), p. 700.

³ This sentence the Bāudh. SS. omits; but it seems necessary for a clear understanding of the situation, as is seen from the fact that Caland in his translation adds a parenthesis '(durch dessen Zauberritual die Kämpfenden einander jedesmal gewogen waren)'.

⁴ I cannot find a satisfactory emendation for *heṣṭur*. Hāi 'ṣṭur = ha + eṣṭur for eṣṭā (MS. ii. 2. 18, p. 25, 14: eṣṭri Āp. x. 12. 5) does not yield a desirable meaning. Professor Hopkins suggested *heṣṭur for *heṣṭā, 'giant' from the root heṣ (Pischel, *Ved. Stud.* i, p. 45–49). Neither suggestion is at all convincing. For the forms in — ṭur Whitney, Gr.⁸ §375, e, Wackernagel KZ. xxv (1882), 287, Altind. Gr., p. 23 § 21, b, might be quoted. Perhaps (ha)-iṣur.

⁵ I have taken *upa + uc (which is not quoted) in the sense of abhi + uc, TS. ii. 2. 2. 5, 'einen Zug haben zu,' 'gern aufsuchen' (PW.). The Bāudh. SS. has here upahāyām āsa, which Caland emends to upahāyām āsa and takes as a euphemism (cf. Oldenberg, GGA. 1889, p. 6, Pischel, *Ved. Stud.* i. p. 196, 'das Lächeln des Mädchens ist die Zustimmung zu den Wünschen des Mannes'; also PW. upa + has 2).

⁶ On this motif see below, § 5.

⁷ I have given sampadamānā a meaning which the causative (PW. s. v. pad + sam, caus. 6.) has.

⁸ gam + ā + ava is read by Grassmann (WB.) and by Boehltingk (pw. ii. p. 158, 3d col. top) at RV. iii. 31. 14, māhi stotrám áva ā ganma sūrér, where, however, the pada-pāṭha reads ávas (Ludwig follows this reading); ava-gam in the epic has the sense 'undertake.'

ship's sides (?),¹ having turned into a leech or a blade of grass.² She asked [her] husband : "The gods and the Asuras who have for a long time been joined in combat—which of them will win?"

126. "Not [so] loud!" he said, "for the earth hath ears." Therefore even now [people] say this:³ "Not [so] loud! For the earth hath ears." "No," she said, "do tell!" He said: "These two Brāhmans know the same, this Brhaspati among the gods and Uśanas Kāvya among the Asuras. What these two perform that accomplishes (?) the same; what offerings the one brings, those [same] the other one [brings also]; these (offerings) meeting together return back⁴ again in the same order. If either of these two (Brāhmans) will unite with the other. [party], [then] they will win. Indra, having learned this, turning into a parrot,⁵ flew up. Noticing him as he was flying he (the Gandharvan) said: "They will be victorious whose greenish-coloured one flies yonder." He (Indra) went to Uśanas Kāvya among the Asuras. He (Indra) said to him: "O sage, what crowd⁶ here art thou aiding? Ours, in sooth,

¹ The Bāudh. SS. reads here: nāurmañdapa (var. lect. nāirmañthye) upaśīṣye (var. lect. upaśīśeṣa). Caland's conjecture (*Abh. f. d. Kunde d. Morgenl.* xii, 1; p. 60) that the first word is to be read nāumañḍa seems to be supported by the JB. text. The exact meaning of the word, which, so far, is only quoted from ŚB. ii. 8. 3. 15 (where the dual occurs), is obscure. The Commentator there takes -mañḍe in the sense of bhitti, and Eggeling follows him in translating it 'the two sides.' PW. and Boehltingk suggest 'oars.' A curious compound mañḍacaraka occurs in the adverb mañḍacaravat (Bāudh. SS. vi. 5 = vol. i. p. 161, 4; cf. *Abh. f. d. K. d. M.* xii, 1, p. 60); Caland there takes mañḍacara in the sense of 'Pflugstrick' = lañgalapāśa.

upaśīśeṣa is undoubtedly the preferable reading for JB. and probably also for Bāudh. SS., although the transformation there (sāuvarṇaḥ paṭaro [var. lect. sāuvarṇam aparo] bhūtvā) does not fit it so well as in JB.

² There is no evidence that the suffix -ka has here a diminutive meaning; Whitney, *Gr.*² 1222, e, f.

³ On this proverb see below, § 4.

⁴ Possibly, on account of the vi-, 'come to naught.'

⁵ The Bāudh. SS. reads here: tac chrutve 'ndro hariḥ śukrarūpaḥ kṛtvo 'tpapāta. But hariḥ śukrarūpaḥ perhaps should better be emended to hariśukarūpaḥ 'the shape of a green parrot.'

⁶ On the contemptuous use of jana, see Geldner, *Ved. Stud.* iii, p. 88, with note 1.

art thou, or we are thine! Turn and join us." "How?" he (U. K.) said, "with what dost thou summon me?" "What these wish-granting [verses]¹ of Virocana, the son of Prahlāda² are, with them!" With them, [namely] with "Forth now"³ the two ran forth. These two the Asuras flung themselves down after;⁴ these two they went after. He said: "O Sage, now indeed these Asuras have gone after⁵ us two." "Do you then

¹ Cf. TMB. vii. 5. 20, uśanā vā kāvyo 'surūnam purohita āśit. tañch devā kāmadughābhīr upāmantrayanta. tasmā etāny āśanāni prāyachan. kāmadughā vā āśanāni.

² In AV. viii. 10. 22, Virocana is the calf (*vatsā*) of *virāj* when Dvimūrdhan milks illusion from her for the Asuras (as, in 26, Indra is the calf of the *virāj* when Savitṛ milks refreshment from her for the gods). In the Chānd. Up. viii. 7. ff., Indra and Virocana are rival pupils of Prajāpati, who, in the interest of the gods and Asuras respectively, try to obtain from Prajāpati a definition of the *ātman*. The Commentator to TMB. vii. 5. 20, introduces Virocana simply as one of the Asuras: pūrvam uśanā nāma kaveḥ putra asurāṇām virocanādīnām purohita āśit.

³ Pra tu is the pratika of RV. ix. 87. 1-8=SV. ii. 27-29 (cf. TMB. xi. 3. 1). The three stanzas form the text for the āśanām sāma (which is given in the Biblioth. Indica edition, vol. iii, p. 81-82), cf. below : tāsu āśanām.

⁴ The reading here should probably be corrected to *anvavajahire* from 2 γ hā, cf. *anūjahire* A.V. xviii. 3. 46 [this is the manuscript reading, emended in the edition, but restored in the translation] though 2 γ hā + *anv-ava* is not quoted. But γ hr + *anv-ava*, which is quoted from Āpastamba SS., does not make good sense. In view of the fact that certain perfect forms in -rire occur (Whitney, *Gr.*² § 799), a confusion between the corresponding 3d persons plural of the perfect of hā and hr is easily accounted for; in fact, the Commentator to AV. xviii. 3. 46 treats *anūjahire* as if it came from γ hr (cf. Whitney's note, *AV. Translation*, vol. ii. p. 861).

⁵ The simple agman resumes the compound *anv-ājagmuḥ*, as giran resumes udgiran MBh. xii. 12872=339. 8 (Wackernagel, *Nach. Gött. Ges. Wiss.* 1902, p. 751). This abbreviation is common everywhere. To the examples collected in the *Lectures on the Study of Language* (1901), p. 314, may be added διακρίθε, κρδή, Gortynian Law, iii. 41; ἐπελάντω, ἐλάντω Coan inscription (Solmsen *Insc. Gr.* no. 33 A = Dittenberger *Syll.*² 616, vs. 11; in the third member of this sentence, the verb is omitted altogether); ἐκμαρτύρια, μαρτυρία Isaeus 3, 21; ἐκδοθέσας, δοθέσας Isaeus 3, 60. For Plato cf. Wackernagel l. c. and Heidel's note on Euthyphro 14 A. Similar cases are: the omission of *per-* in the second of two conjoined adjectives (e. g. *perfacilis et expedita* for *perfacilis et perexpedita*) discussed by Madvig, on Cic. de finib. iii. 11, 36, p. 410; the omission of the identical second member in the former of two conjoined compounds (Wackernagel, *Altind. Gramm.* II, 1. § 11 c β, p. 30-31, with references);

arrange it so," he said, "that these may not go after us two." The two started upon' this.

127. "God Indu with good armor, curse-defeating, aware of stratagems,² purifies himself, the father of the gods, the very doughty progenitor, the pillar of the heaven, the supporter of the earth." With this these two erected a pillar up to heaven. The Asuras [could] not go beyond this. These two came to the gods with these wish-granting [verses]. These two, having come, they (the gods) exalted (?): "The seer, inspired, the leader of people, cunning, constant, Uśanas, through wisdom, it was he who found what of these (fem.) was hidden, the secret, hidden name of the cows." These same verses are connected with cattle; he who has praised with these verses obtains cattle, he becomes possessed of much cattle. To them³ the Āuśana

and the omission of inflectional or derivative⁴ endings in the former of two copulatively connected words (Steglich, *Über die Ersparung von Flexions- und Bildungssilben bei copulativen Verbindungen in Zt. f. deut. Wortforschung* iii, 1902, p. 1-52; Wackernagel, *Altind. Gramm.* i, p. xvii with notes 3 and 4; Richter, *Ind. Forsch.* ix (1898), p. 29; Hopkins, *JAOS.* xxiii, p. 111).

Since semantic changes arise in connected discourse rather than in isolated words, there can be but little doubt that the majority of the cases in which the simplex carries the meaning of the compound (cf. the references collected by Brugmann, *Berichte d. sächs. Ges. d. Wiss.* li, 1899, p. 193, note 1, and Franke, *ZDMG.* xliv, 481, Brugmann, *Berichte d. sächs. Ges. d. Wiss.*, lii, 1900, p. 395-6; *Grundriss* ii, p. 83 f.; Solmsen, *Unters. z. griech. Laut- u. Verslehre*, p. 215, note 1; also for proper names, Brugmann, *Griech. Gramm.*⁵ p. 175 § 165, and Lidzbarski, *Ephem. f. semit. Epigraphie*, ii. p. 1), owes its origin to this practice of abbreviating a repeated compound.

¹ Cf. Boehltingk, p.w. sub 'pad + prati, no. 11.

² vrjanā is the reading of SV. for vrjanam of RV. In the translation of the word in this passage I have followed Geldner (*Ved. Stud.* i, p. 143) and Foy (KZ. xxxiv (1897) p. 251), rather than Oldenberg (*Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1890, I, p. 415 with note 3). The parallel passage RV. x. 42. 10, vrjáñena, and AV. vii. 50. 7, vrjaníbhis, seems to determine the meaning of vrjana in our passage quite irrespective of any etymology.

³ Burnell, *Ārṣeyabrahmaṇa* (Mangalore 1876), *Introd.*, p. xi-xii. 'by a sāman was intended a melody or chant, independent of the words [hence anṛcaṁ sāma cf. note on JUB. I. 15. 8]: . . . the earliest records that we have make a distinction between the chant and the words, and treat the first as of more importance . . . A sāman is sung (gāi) on (or, as we should say, to) a ṛc (ṛci). This idiom is an old one, for it occurs in the Brāhmaṇas repeatedly; if the ṛc (or words) really formed part of the sāman, this idiom would be impossible.'

[-sāman] [is sung]. Uśanas Kāvya, namely, among the gods desired the immortal world of the Gandharvans; he saw this sāman; with it he praised. Thence verily he among the gods attained the immortal world of the Gandharvans. That same is a world-finding sāman; he among the gods attains the immortal world of the Gandharvans who has praised with it. Because Uśanas Kāvya saw it, therefore it is called Āuśana [-sāman].

4. The Proverb: 'The earth hath ears.'

The words *mo 'ccaiḥ karpinī vāi bhūmīḥ*, 'not so loud, for the earth hath ears' are clearly marked as a proverb by the preceding *tad idam apy etarhy āhuh* 'and so even now people say.' In the parallel passage of the Bāndhāyana Sūtra¹ (xxi. 15), the word corresponding to *bhūmīḥ* of our text is corrupt. The mss. read, Caland writes me, *karpinī vāi nāurūpa* or *nōrūpa iti*, and there is no express indication, as in our text, that the words are a proverb.

In exactly this form I have not been able to find the proverb elsewhere, although the idea that the earth is aware of one's evil actions is familiar, as in Manu, viii. 85-86: "Evil-doers think 'no one sees us,' but . . . the earth . . . knows of the conduct (*bhūmir . . . vṛttajñā*) of all corporate beings." (1) 'The road hath ears,' (2) 'The walls have ears,' (3) 'The woods have ears,' and (4) '(Small) pitchers have (big) ears' seem to be the four versions most clearly related to that of our text.²

(1) 'The road hath ears' is a Jewish proverb³ and is quoted in Parasha 32 of the Midrash Wayyikra Rabba.⁴ The date of the Midrash is placed not later than the seventh (Zunz) nor earlier than the fifth century (Dalman).

¹ Cf. Caland's translation in *Abh. f. d. K. d. Morgenl.* xii (1903), No. 1, p. 26: 'Nicht zu laut, Ohren hat ja das Schiff (?).'

² In the following early occurrences only have been given. For later references cf. Wander's *Deutsches Sprichwörter Lexicon*, 1867 ff., I. v. Düringsfeld, *Sprichwörter der german. u. roman. Sprachen*, 1872 ff., and similar works. Cf. also G. Pitrè, *Proverbi Siciliani* I. p. civ-cv and iv, p. 165-6 (= vols. 8 and 11 of his *Biblioteca delle Tradizione Popolari Siciliani*) for modern parallels in many languages.

³ Abraham M. Tendlau, *Sprichwörter und Redensarten deutsch-jüdischer Vorzeit* (1860), p. 292, no. 861.

⁴ A German translation may be found in A. Wünsche's *Bibliotheka Rabbinica*, Lieferung 26 = *Der Midrasch Wajikra Rabba*, 1884, p. 223.

(2) ‘The walls have ears.’ In the form ‘the wall hath ears’ this is found in the same Midrash, where it is joined to the preceding.¹ It occurs again in the Midrash Kohelet Rabba² (on Ecclesiastes x. 20). St. Jerome (340–420 A.D.) in his Commentary to this same verse of Ecclesiastes, quotes it as a common proverb³: ‘Quod autem ait: “Avis coeli aufert vocem, et habens pennas annuntiabit verbum,” hyperbolice intelligendum, quomodo solemus dicere *etiam ipsos parietes, quibus consciis loquimur, quae audierint non celaturos*’ (Migne, *Patrol. Lat.*, vol. 23, col. 1100 = vol. iii, col. 479 of D. Vallarsi’s second edition, Venice, 1776).

(3) ‘The woods have ears,’ often with the addition ‘and the fields have eyes.’ The earliest occurrence seems to be in a ms. of the eleventh century⁴ (No. 196 of the Cathedral Library at Cologne). This collection of moral maxims is dedicated to Adalbold, bishop at Utrecht (1010–1026). Its anonymous author according to Voigt (l. c. p. xix) was Egbert of Liège. The date of its composition is fixed by Voigt (l. c. p. xii) at about 1023. Verse 93 reads:

Rure valent oculi densis in saltibus aures.

This hexameter has obviously nothing to do with our proverb. It clearly means that a man in the open field should rely on his eyesight, while in the woods he should depend on the acuteness of his hearing.⁵ Such was also the understanding of the glossa-

¹ Cf. Wünsche *l. c.*, ‘R. Levi sagte: ‘Der Weg hat Ohren und so auch die Wand.’’ Fischer (*Mittheilungen des Seminars f. oriental. Sprachen . . . zu Berlin*, Jahrgang I, 1898, Zweite Abtheilung, p. 218, no. 31) cites a Moroccan proverb: ‘All walls have ears’ with the explanation: ‘sc. Fenster, durch die man alles sehen kann.’

² Translated into German in A. Wünsche’s *Bibliotheca Rabbínica*, Lieferung 1 = *der Midrasch Kohelet* 1880, p. 143.

³ After that the earliest quotation I could find is in Spanish, in Cervantes’ *Segunda Parte del ingenioso Cavallero Don Quixote de la Mancha*, 1615, fol. 182 verso, line 21, ‘las paredes tienē oydos,’ translated by Shelton in his translation of the second part of *Don Quixote*, 1620, p. 320: ‘but Mum: they say walls have eares.’ But there are undoubtedly earlier passages.

⁴ Edited by Ernst Voigt, with the title *Egberts von Lüttich Fecunda Ratis*, 1889. The part here referred to was first printed by Bartsch, *Germania xviii* (1878), p. 318.

⁵ This same idea is also stated in the form ‘Plana gerit numen, nemus audit vocis acumen’ quoted by Voigt (*Fecunda Ratis*, p. 28), from the

tor who notes: 'Quod suum est oculorum, longius vident in patulis campis, et vox ab auribus clarior auditur in silvis.' But in the lower margin of the same page the hand *n* has added this verse:

Silva suas aures et habent sua lumina campi

which is our proverb.¹

In England it occurs for the first time in the early part of the thirteenth century. It is found in a manuscript² of Trinity College, Cambridge (O. 2. 45), written, according to Wright, 'at the beginning of the thirteenth century,' and containing 'translations into Latin leonines of some of the more popular English, and in one or two instances, Norman proverbs of that time.' Here it is given both in English:

‘Veld haveſt hege, and wude haveſt heare,’

and in Latin:

‘Campus habet lumen, et habet nemus auris acumen.’

In the fourteenth century we find it in Chaucer's Knights Tale,³ vs. 1521 f. 'feeld hath eyen, and the wode hath eres,'

Proverbia Rustici, a thirteenth century collection of proverbs at Paris, (published in *Romanische Forschungen*, iii, p. 633–41, where it is No. 41, p. 637). Still another form is 'Non caret aure nemus nec latus lumine campus,' which Roethe in his edition of Reinmar von Zweter (1887), p. 604, quotes from J. Wegeler's *Philosophia patrum* 126. (Wegeler's book is not accessible to me.) None of these three proverbs should be given as a real parallel to 'The woods have ears.'

¹ Heinrich Bebel, who was born in the last quarter of the fifteenth century and published his *Proverbia Germanica* in 1508, interprets the proverb 'Campus habet oculos, silva aures' in this way: 'dicitur quod nihil faciamus in silvis et campo (ubi homines esse possunt) quod occultum esse volumus. Cf. W. H. D. Suringar, *Heinrich Bebel's Proverbia Germanica* (Leiden) 1879, p. 34, No. 101.

² Thomas Wright, *Essays on Subjects connected with the Literature, popular Superstitions, and History of England in the Middle Ages*, i (1846), p. 168. The passage is referred to in Skeats' note to Chaucer's Knight's Tale, 1521; W. Wackernagel, *Kleine Schriften*, iii (1874), p. 194; Roethe's note on Reinmar v. Zweter, 187, 1 (1887, p. 480).

³ W. Haeckel, *Das Sprichwort bei Chaucer*, 1890, p. 22, No. 71 (= *Erlanger Beiträge zur Englischen Philologie*, viii).

and a century later¹ in the Ballad of King Edward and the Shepherd:² 'Wode has erys, felde has sigt.'

In German also the first quotable instance of the proverb belongs to the first half of the thirteenth century. It occurs twice in the same poet,³ viz. Reinmar von Zweter (born⁴ not long after 1200). At 137, 1 he has

' Walt hât ôren, velt gesiht
ir hôhen rûner, rûnet von dem richen keiser niht,'

and at 185, 7

' Er weiz wol: Velt hât ougen, walt hat ôren,
sus macht er sîner vindre speher tôren.

Nor was it possible to trace the French form of the proverb back of the thirteenth century. From a collection⁵ of French proverbs accompanied by a Latin version in cod. Voss. Lat. 31 F. of the University Library at Leyden, which upon linguistic evidence he judges to have been composed during the thirteenth century,⁶ Zacher quotes

Bois (ms. has Vois) a oreilles, et plain a eus
with the Latin version,

Voces secretas audit nemus auriculatum
Rem minus occultum planum videt ens oculatum.

¹ It is not clear on what ground Thomas Wright (*Essays on Subjects connected with Literature, popular Superstitions and History of England in the Middle Ages*, i, 1846, p. 168) ascribes this ballad to the thirteenth century. Hartshorne, who printed it from a fifteenth century ms. (Ff. v. lxviii in the Public Library of the University of Cambridge) thinks (*Ancient Metrical Tales*, p. xii) 'the language as old as Edward IV,' i. e. the middle of the fifteenth century. Cf. Child's *Ballads*, v, 71.

² C. H. Hartshorne, *Ancient Metrical Tales*, London, 1829, p. 46. The poem is referred to by Uhland, *Schriften z. Gesch. d. Dichtung und Sage*, iii (1866), p. 178, note 285.

³ Grimm. *Deut. Wörterb.* vii, col. 1250 s.v. Ohr iv. 3; Lexner, *Mittelhochdeut. Handwörterb.*, 1876, ii, col. 184, s.v. ôre; M. Heyne, *Deut. Wörterbuch*, 1892, ii, col. 1062, s.v. Ohr; Uhland, *Schriften z. Gesch. d. Dicht. u. Sage* iii (1866), p. 173, note 285; Bartsch, *Germania* xviii (1873) p. 318; W. Wackernagel, *Kleine Schriften*, iii (1874), p. 194.

⁴ G. Roethe, *Die Gedichte Reinmar's von Zweter*, (1887) p. 19.

⁵ Zacher in *Haupt's Zeit. f. deut. Alterthum*, xi (1859) p. 124-5. The passage is referred to by Roethe in his note to Reinmar v. Zweter 137, 1 (1887, p. 480); Bartsch, *Germania*, xviii (1873) p. 318; Suringar, *Heinrich Bebel's Proverbia Germanica*, Leiden, 1879, p. 247; Voigt, *Fecunda Ratis* (1889), p. 28.

⁶ Zacher, *I. c.*, p. 144.

This seems to be the earliest French occurrence, The Proverbia Gallicana, which contain, according to Le Roux de Lincy,¹ most of the maxims known in the thirteenth century collection of the Proverbes ruraux and vulgaux and were first printed in 1519, have 'Buisson a oreilles.'²

The two passages to which Zacher refers, viz., Le Roux de Lincy I¹, p. 40=I², p. 60, 'Le bois a oreilles, et le champ des yeux' and Le Roux de Lincy II¹, p. 387=II², p. 474 (Appendice III) 'Boisson ad oreilles, boys escont' (this latter from the Proverbes de France in a manuscript of the Corpus Christi Library at Cambridge) are given without date. Randle Cotgrave (1632) cites³ the proverb in this form: 'Bois ont oreilles; & champs oeillets,' and notes: 'Wherein the Jewes-eare-Mushrome is the woods eare.'

(4) 'Pitchers have ears.' In this form the proverb occurs twice in Shakespeare,⁴ in the *Taming of the Shrew* (iv. 4) and in *Richard the Third* (ii. 4), neither of which was published before 1594. 'Small pitchers have wide ears' is used by John Heywood in *A dialogue conteynynge the number of the effectuall prouerbes in the Englishe tonge* (Londini), 1562, part ii, chap. v, line 10. According to Malone,⁵ 'Small pitchers have great ears' occurs in William Bulleyn's *A Dialogue both pleasant and pietifull*, 1564.

The absence of anything closely resembling our proverb in classical literature is rather noteworthy. The only proverb at

¹ Le Roux de Lincy, *Le Livre des Proverbes François*, 2d ed., I (1859) p. xxxvi. The passage is referred to by Suringar, *Heinrich Bebel's Proverbia Germanica*, Leiden, 1879, p. 247; Voigt, *Fecunda Ratis*, 1889, p. 23.

² Quoted by Le Roux de Lincy, *l. c.*, p. 61, from a ms. of the fifteenth century.

³ *A Dictionarie of French and English Tongues*, London, 1632, s.v. Oreille and Oillet. The passage is referred to by Skeats, note to Chaucer's Knight's Tale 1521.

⁴ M. C. Wahl, in *Jahrbuch d. deutschen Shakespeare Gesellschaft*, xxii (1887), p. 111 f. and in *Jahresbericht xvii (1884-5) der höheren Handelsfachschule zu Erfurt*, *Das Parömiologische Sprachgut bei Shakespeare*, II, 27.

⁵ Cf. John S. Farmer's edition in the *Early English Dramatists, The Dramatic Writings of John Heywood*, vol. ii (1906), p. 65.

⁶ *The Plays of William Shakespeare*, vol. x, London, 1793, p. 546 f., note to Richard III.

all similar to the four discussed above is the παλαιὰ παροιμία introduced by Aristophanes, *Thesmophoriazusae*, 527.

τὴν παροιμίαν δέπαινω
τὴν παλαιάν· ἵππο λίθῳ γάρ
παντὶ πον χρῆ
μη δάκη — μήτωρ δύθρεῖν

which the Greek paroemiographers cite as "Υπὸ παντὶ λίθῳ σκορπίος, Zenob. vi. 20; Diogenian. viii. 29, etc.; cf. Leutsch's note in the *Corpus Paroemiogr. Graec.* i. 166). Elsewhere in classical literature, as in Arabic¹ and Hebrew,² the injunction against talking is couched in very general and abstract terms, such as Simonides' 'Εστι³ καὶ σιγᾶς ἀκίνδυνον γέρας (cf. Apostol. vii. 97; Arsen. xxiv. 65, with Leutsch's note in the *Corpus Paroem. Graec.* where a number of passages de silentii virtute are collected), or the Latin 'Nullum putaveris esse locum sine teste' in the Sententiae ascribed to Publius Syrus⁴ and in the Liber de Moribus⁵ ascribed to Seneca, whence Vincent de Beauvais quotes it three times⁶ in his *Speculum Doctrinale*, printed in Venice, 1494.

These proverbs rest on the ancient belief that not only divinities⁷ but also animals and inanimate objects may become wit-

¹ Cf. the references s.v. silentium in G. W. Freytag's *Arabum Proverbia*.

² Cf. Wolff, *Zur Spruchkunde*, ZDMG. lv (1901), p. 398, No. 3.

³ Schneidewin, *Delectus Poet. Elegic. Graec.*, Göttingen, 1838, p. 398, frag. 52. Horace translates it (Carm: iii. 2. 25): *Est et fidei tuta silentio merces.*

⁴ In Ribbeck's *Scenic. Roman. Poesis*, II², 1873, p. 366, Appendix sententiarum 16. Also Orelli, *Poetarum veterum Lat. et recent. quorundam carmina sententiosa*, I, 1822, p. 236.

⁵ Incerti auctoris liber qui vulgo dicitur de moribus, No. 79, in Wölfflin, *Publili Syri Sententiae*, 1869, p. 142.

⁶ Viz., Lib. iv, cap. 92 'De Taciturnitate' and cap. 170 'De Garrulitate et Turpiloquio'; Nullū sine teste locu esse putaveris,' and Lib. v, cap. 35, 'De Interioribz vite pprie testibz observādis'; Nullū putaveris esse locū sine teste.

⁷ Cf. the commentators on AV. iv. 16, and on καὶ καφοῦ συνίημι καὶ οὐ φωνεῖτος ἀκοῖς of the Delphic oracle, Herod i. 47. Here belongs probably also the 'Απόλλων τετράστος (Zenob. i. 54, etc.; Pauly-Wissowa, *Realencyclop.* ii, col. 70) for Wide's interpretation of this epithet (*Lakonische Kulte*, p. 95) which follows Welcker (*Griech. Götterlehre*, i, 473), seems to me far fetched and improbable.

nesses of anything done in secret,¹ and, if they choose, betray it.²

¹ Thus in Theocritus, *Id.* xxvii. 57, the girl is frightened by a noise (*ἢχον ἄκον*), but her lover quiets her by saying it is only the trees talking about their love affair (*ἀλλήλαις λαλέοντι τεδν γάμον αἱ κυπάρισσοι*). Aristophanes, *Ates*, 601, preserves a proverb in οὐδεὶς οἶδεν τὸν θησαυρὸν τὸν ἔμδν πλὴν εἰ τις ἀρ' ὅρνις; the scholia of the cod. Rav. (ed. Rutherford, London, 1896, vol. I, p. 473) expressly note: παροιμια[κῶς] τούτῳ; οὐδεὶς οἶδε τι μυιλῆσσα πλὴν ὁ παριπτάμενος ὅρνις and τούτῳ ἐλέγετο ἐπὶ τῶν ἀγρωτῶν; in Latin literature luna, sidera, matutina pruina, coryli, and fluminia (Juv. vi. 811; viii. 149; Propert. ii. 9. 41; Verg. Ecl. v. 21) are mentioned as witnesses. Professor Geldner called my attention to TS. iii. 5. 7. 2, devā vāi brahmann avadanta, tat parna upāśrṇot.

² As in the Midas story (E. Kuhnert, ZDMG. xl, 1886, pp. 551, 555 f.; Roscher's *Lexicon*, ii, part 2, col. 2968). Kuhnert regards this motif as a later addition to the Midas story. Cf. also Gustav Meyer, *Essays und Studien zur Sprachgeschichte und Volkskunde*, 1885, p. 196 f.; Voigt on *Fecunda Ratis*, 1889, p. 199, vs. 1629, 'Si infodias scrobibus, cantabunt carmina canne'); the story of Ibycus and the cycle of tales related to it (cf. the very full bibliography in W. Hertz' *Gesammelte Abhandlungen hrsg. von F. v. d. Leyen*, 1905, p. 334, notes 1 and 2; G. Amalfi, *Zeit. d. Vereins f. Volkskunde*, vi, 1896, pp. 115-129); the story of the discovery of the murderers of Hesiod (very fully discussed by Friedel in Fleckeisen's *Jahrbücher f. klass. Philol.*, x. Supplementband, 1878-9, p. 235-278; cf. also W. Hertz' *Gesammelte Abhandlungen hrsg. v. F. v. d. Leyen*, 1905, p. 333, note 1); the stories in which the murderer is discovered by a flute made out of the murdered man's bone (collected in Bolte's edition of R. Köhler's *Klein. Schriften* i, p. 49 and 54; von der Leyen, *Herrig's Archiv*, vol. 114, 1905, p. 9 with note 8), and a similar cycle of stories (E. Cosquin, *Contes Populaires de Lorrain* [1886] i, p. 268-267, No. 26, 'Le sifflet enchanté'; Köhler and Bolte in the notes on No. 51 of Laura Gonzenbach's *Sicilianische Märchen*, 1870, and in *Zeit. des Vereins f. Volkskunde*, vi, 1896, p. 162). Plutarch relates (Theseus, 8) that Sinnis' daughter Perigune invoked the στοιβή-plants and wild asparagus in which she hid to save and conceal her, ἀκάκις πάνυ καὶ παιδικὸς δισταυρότεννα δεομένη.

Thus Habbakuk's threat (ii. 11): 'For the stone out of the wall will cry and the spar out of the wood will answer it' (which recurs, though with a different application, in Luke xix. 40; cf. also Voigt's note on *Fecunda Ratis*, p. 199, vs. 1628, 'Si taceant homines, factum iumenta locuntur') is not mere hyperbole (although the stone is proverbial for silence, cf. Ovid, Metam. ii. 696, 'tutus eas; lapis iste prius tua furta loquetur,' and other instances collected in J. J. Westenii, *Novum Testamentum Graecum*, Amsterdam, 1751, note on Luke xix. 40). In the case of the Venerable Bede the stones actually responded: 'cum prae nimia senectute eius oculi caligassent... quadam vice, dum per quandam vallem magnis lapidibus plenam transirent, eius discipulus derisionis causa eidem dixit quod ibi esset magnus populus congregatus qui eius

In love-poetry the fear that nature will betray secret love has become a *locus communis*.¹

praedicationem . . . exspectarent . . . Cum in fine "Per omnia secula seculorum" conclusisset, mox, ut aiunt, alta voce clamaverunt: "Amen, venerabilis pater." Quia igitur venerabilem eum miraculose lapides vocaverunt ideo venerabilis pater appellatur.' Jacobi a Voragine, *Legenda Aurea*, cap. 181 § 4, p. 833 of T. Graesse's edition (1846).

For the English proverbial expression: "A little bird told me," cf. *Notes and Queries*, 1st series, vol. iv. 1852, p. 394.

On the general belief that animals and inanimate objects, even the saliva (Liebrecht, *Zur Volkskunde*, 1879, p. 249 and 250; R. Koehler and Bolte, note on No. 14 of Laura Gonzenbach's *Sicilianische Märchen*, 1870, and in *Zeit. d. Vereins f. Volkskunde*, vi, 1896, p. 65) were endowed with a soul and the gift of speech, cf. the references collected by F. v. d. Leyen in *Herrig's Archiv*, vol. 114, 1905, pp. 5-11 and 13 f. Fröbenius, *Die Weltanschauung der Naturvölker*, p. 38, quoted by Fries, *Rhein. Mus.* lix, 1904, p. 217: Gruppe, *Griech. Mythol.* ii, p. 790.

The question whether plants were *ἔψυχα* or not was a mooted point among Greek philosophers, cf. Aristot. *De plantis* i, p. 815 Bekk. = p. 6 Apelt; E. H. F. Meyer, *Nicolai Damasceni de plantis libri II* Aristotelii vulgo adscripti, Lipsiae, 1841, p. 6 with notes; Plutarch *De placitis philosophorum* v. 26. 1-3.

¹ So in the final stanza of Walther's von der Vogelweide 'Unter der linden': 'wes er mit mir pflege | niemer niemen | bevinde daz wan er und ich | unde ein kleinez vogellin. | tandaradei! | daz mac wol getruwe sfn.' Arnold has collected a cycle of lyrical poems of South-eastern Europe with this motif (*Zeitsch. d. Vereins f. Volkskunde*, xii, 1902, pp. 155-167 and 291-295, with a few additions by H. Tardel, in *Herrig's Archiv*, vol. 114, 1905, p. 278, note 1; cf. also, on the same subject Karl Dietrich, *ibid.*, p. 285 f. and a few additional references in vol. xiii, 1903, p. 426-428.) In an Egyptian love poem edited by W. Max Müller from a Turin ms. of the twentieth dynasty, and probably of the same date (i. e. 1200-1150 B. C.) the offended pomegranate tree threatens to betray the lovers: 'Ich bin ein(er) erster (Klasse) [unter den Bäumen,] aber sie (?) betrachten mich (?) als (einen) zweiten (Ranges). Wenn man wiederholt, das zu thun nochmals (!), nicht werde ich für sie (beide) stillschweigen. [Ich werde aufhören], sie [zu verberg]en?' In another poem from the same ms. the faithful sycamore promises silence; 'Ich bin verschwiegenen Sinnes, nicht zu sagen was ich sehe' (W. Max Müller, *Die Liebespoesie der alten Aegypter*, Leipzig, 1899, p. 39 and 40).

A similar commonplace in classical erotic poetry was the personification of the mistress' door, cf. Rothstein's note to Propertius 1. 16, and his reply to Leo's (*Götting. Gel. Anz.* 1898, p. 722) strictures in *Philologus* lix, 1900, p. 445; Fries, *Rhein. Mus.* lix, 1904, p. 213-219.

5. The motif of the betrayal of the husband's secret by his wife.

This motif, in the exact form as given in our story, is not so frequent as might at first be supposed. In Sanskrit an early reference to it is found in AB. iii. 22. 1 : After Indra has refused to answer the question of the gods, ‘these gods said : “Here is this beloved favorite wife of Indra, Prasahā by name; come, let us ask her.”—“Yes.”—They asked her. She said to them: “I shall answer you to morrow.”’ Therefore women ask their husband, and therefore a woman asks her husband during the night.’ The story of Samson¹ makes use of it twice; in the story of Delilah’s betrayal (Jud. 16) and in the story of the riddle (Jud. 14). The two have been mixed and confused by the anonymous author of a mediæval² Συναξάριον τῶν εὐγενικῶν γυναικῶν καὶ τιμιωτάτων ἀρχοντίσσων, who says (vss. 227–9) :

καὶ πρῶτα τριάντα ἔχασεν ἀπὲ τὰ ποκάμισά του
καὶ τριάντα ἀπὲ τὰ ρούχα του διὰ τὴν Δαλιδάν του,
ὅπου τον ἀδίκησε πολλὰ καὶ ἐπε τῶν ἀλλοφύλων.

The former has become a locus communis.³ In a Homily on the death of John the Baptist, which appears in Latin as the fiftieth Homilia de Sanctis of Paulus Diaconus (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* vol. 95, col. 1508) and, in Greek, as a spurious homily of John Chrysostom (Migne, *Patr. Graec.* vol 59, col. 485) it is discussed at length and reference is made to the prophet Micah’s injunction⁴ (vii. 5)) : ‘A coninge tua custodi te, ne manifester ei cor tuum.’⁵

¹ Ed. Meyer, *Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme*, 1906, p. 529, ‘da er (the old Samson myth) in der uns vorliegenden Gestalt überall gründlich umgewandelt und durchsetzt ist mit Zügen, die dem Gebiete der volksthümlichen Schwänke und des Märchens angehören.’

² Krumbacher fixes its date as the sixteenth century, *Sitzungsber. d. Bayer. Akad.* 1905, p. 371; the verses quoted are on page 382.

³ Cf. e. g. E. Voigt’s edition of Egbert’s von Lüttich *Fecunda Ratis*, 1889, p. 284.

⁴ This is practically identical with one advice in the cycle of the stories of The Three Advices, Koehler’s *Klein. Schrift.* ii, p. 400.

⁵ In medieval literature the incapability of women to keep a secret has become an axiom, cf. e. g. Andreae Capellani Regii Francorum *De Amore Libri tres* (ed. E. Trojel, Havniae, 1892), p. 353: ‘Praeterea nulla novit mulier aliquod occultare secretum. Quanto enim aliquid secretius iniungitur mulieri servandum, tanto avidius illud cunctis indicare laborat. Nec potuit usque ad haec tempora femina inveniri quae aliquid

Somewhat the same motif¹ is used in a folk-tale of Soqotra² published in the original and in translation by D. H. Müller (*Die Mehri und Soqatri Sprache*, ii, p. 82 f., No. 14 'Die Gattenmörderin' = vol. vi of *Südarabische Expedition*, pub-

sibi in secreto positum reservaret occultum, quamvis illud sit magnum, vel inde videatur alicui mortis interitus evenire. Quidquid enim secretum alicuius fidei mulieris iniungitur, eius penitus videtur urere intrinseca nisi primitus iniuncta sibi damnose secreta revelet . . . Secretum ergo tuum ab omni studeas femina custodire,' and p. 347, 'Nunquam ergo te reddas in mulieris promissione vel iureiurando securum, quia nulla manet fides in muliere, sed tuae mentis propositum studeas mulieri semper servare occultum et tua sibi noli aperire secreta, ut sic artem arte deludas et eius valeas excludere fraudem. Samson enim cuius cunctis satis probitas est manifesta, quia mulieri sua non novit celare secreta, ab ea in cordis duplicitate deceptus ab inimicorum legitur exercitu superatus et ab eisdem captus corporis virtute et oculorum simul est visione privatus. De muliebris quoque aliis infinitis percipimus quae suos viros et amatores, eo quod eis sua non noverunt occultare secreta, turpiter in sermonis duplicitate prodidisse leguntur.' This general truth is not infrequently concretely illustrated. These tales [cf. the references collected by Oesterly in his notes to Nos. 125 and 126 of the *Gesta Romanorum* (1872, p. 732) repeated in F. Vetter's edition of Kunraths von Ammenhausen *Schachzabelbuch*, note 72 to vs. 3061 (published as Ergänzungsband in the *Bibliothek älterer Schriftwerke der deutschen Schweiz*, hrsg. v. J. Baechtold und F. Vetter, 1892, p. 159); by Bolte in his note to Montanus' *Gartengesellschaft* in Bibliothek des Literarischen Vereins in Stuttgart, vol. 127 (1899), p. 592 f.; in R. Koehler's *Klein. Schriften*. ii, p. 557; in J. Jacobs' edition of William Painter's *Palace of Pleasure*, i (1890), p. lxviii, note to No. 18; and in H. Regnier's introduction to the sixth fable of book viii of La Fontaine 'Les femmes et le secret,' in his edition of La Fontaine (*Les Grands Écrivains de la France*) vol. ii, 1884, p. 288 f.] fall, as far as I can determine, into a number of well defined cycles. The two most popular ones are : (1) The 'historia de Papirio Praetextato' which goes back to Gellius i. 23 (= Macrobius, Sat. i. 6. 19 ff.), who quotes it from Cato's *oratio ad milites contra Galbam*. (2) The husband's test of his wife's secrecy by a wonderful tale ; this appears in two main forms : (a) the version of the eggs, e. g. Abstemius' fab. 129, 'De Viro qui Uxori se Ovum peperisse dixerat,' and (b) the version of the ravens, e. g. *Gesta Romanorum*, No. 125 (ed. Oesterley). A third story, which combines elements of (1) and (2), is Plutarch's story of the Roman senator, *De Garrulit*. 11, but this seems to have been little imitated ; Regnier's only reference is to Noël du Fail's *Contes et Discours d' Eutrapel* 33, vol. ii, p. 311 f. of Assézat's edition, 1874.

¹ Not exactly the same, because the wife does not worm the secret out of her husband with intent to betray him.

² An island to the East of Cape Guardafui, controlling the entrance to the Gulf of Aden.

lished by the Imperial Academy of Vienna, 1905). In this story the husband is visited by his brother-in-law. In the room the child wrapped up in a cloth is suspended from a rope made of dog's hair. The husband bargains with his brother-in-law as follows : 'If you guess before morning what this rope is made of, you shall kill me, otherwise I shall kill you.' The wife overhears this agreement between her husband and her brother. For a long time the brother unsuccessfully tries to guess the riddle. When there is only one hour left until day-break the wife makes the child cry and, while rocking it to sleep, she croons an old lullaby which, by the clever change of one word (*il-kálb* for *il-bóg*), conveys the desired information to her brother, who thus wins the wager and kills the betrayed husband.

Here belong also, in spite of some modifications, the two cycles discussed¹ in Bolte's edition of R. Koehler's *Klein-Schriften*, ii, p. 400. The first of these deals with the betrayal of the husband's secret by his wife, because she is angered at his introducing her as his greatest enemy. The second cycle contains the stories of the Three Advices, one of which is: 'Do not confide a secret to your wife.' In all the stories belonging to these two cycles it is the angry wife who betrays her husband in revenge, and the feature of the wife's worming the secret out of her husband with treacherous intent is absent.

¹ Cf. also *Zeitschrift d. Vereins f. Volkskunde*, vi, 1896, p. 170 f., and F. Seiler's ed. of the Ruodlieb, 1882, Halle, p. 47 f.

Xenophon's Account of the Fall of Nineveh.—By PAUL
HAUPT, Professor in the Johns Hopkins University,
Baltimore, Md.

XENOPHON relates in his *Anabasis* (3, 4, 7) that when after the battle of Cunaxa (between the Euphrates and the Tigris, probably 75 miles NW. of Babylon) the Greeks moved along the Tigris, they came (about the end of the year 401 b. c.) to a large city in ruins, which was called *Larissa*.¹ It had formerly been inhabited by the Medes. The wall was 25 feet wide, and 100 feet high; the circumference was two parasangs, *i. e.* about seven miles. It was built of bricks; *κρηπίς δὲ ὑπῆν λιθόν τὸ ὕψος ἀκούσι ποδῶν*, under it was a stone *κρηπίς* (see below) 20 feet high.² At the time when the Persians deprived the Medes of their dominions, the King of the Persians besieged the city, but was unable to capture it. Finally there appeared a cloud which veiled the sun so that the inhabitants left the city. Near this city was a stone pyramid,³ one plethron wide, *i. e.* about 100 feet square, and two plethra high. Many barbarians had fled there from the neighboring villages.

From Larissa, they marched one day's jourhey (of six parasangs, *i. e.* about 20 miles) to a large ruined castle⁴ near a city,

¹ Xenophon no doubt means *Calah*, the present Nimrûd; but the name *Larissa* may be a corruption of *Resen*; see below.

² Or. *deep*; cf. Latin *altus*.

³ That is, a temple-tower, Assyr. *ziggurratu*; see the cut on p. 187 of the translation of *Ezekiel*, in the Polychrome Bible. I have pointed out there that the temple-tower is, as it were, a huge altar, and that the Egyptian pyramids appear to be a subsequent modification of the primitive Babylonian temple-tower. The interior of the Solomonic Temple resembled, to a certain extent, a Babylonian temple-tower of three stories; see Crit. Notes on Kings (SBOT.), p. 86, l. 22; cf. KAT.², 617, 3. The temple-tower of Nimrûd seems to have had five stories; cf. Max Freiherr von Oppenheim, *Vom Mittelmeer zum Persischen Golf*, vol. 2 (Berlin, 1900), p. 201.

⁴ This is no doubt the Acropolis of Nineveh, now known as *Kouyunjik* (قوچق). The distance between *Kouyunjik* and Nimrûd is about 20 miles. See the large map in the second volume of Freiherr von Oppenheim's work (cited above) and the smaller map facing p. 182; also the maps in Col. Billerbeck's article, BA. 3.

called *Mespila*, which was formerly inhabited by Medes. The *κρηπίς*¹ was of polished shell-limestone, 50 feet wide and 50 feet high. Over it (*ἐπὶ δὲ ταύτῃ*)² there was a brick wall 50 feet wide and 100 feet high. The circumference was about six parasangs, i. e. about 20 miles.³ The queen of the King of the Medes is said to have fled there⁴ when the Medes were deprived of their dominion by the Persians. The King of the Persians besieged the place,⁵ but could not capture it,⁶ either by time (*χρόνος*) i. e. a long siege, or by force (assault). Finally Zeus terrified the inhabitants by a thunder storm,⁷ and thus the city⁸ was captured.

This account is somewhat inaccurate; but it is still possible to discern the historical nucleus. In the first place, we must substitute *Assyrians* for *Medes*, and *Medes* for *Persians*. The city was inhabited by the *Assyrians*, and it was captured by the *Medes*. The names *Medes*, *Persians*, *Assyrians*, *Babylonians*, are often confounded. Herodotus (I, 178) calls Babylon the capital of Assyria; cf. also 3, 92 (I, 185; 4, 39) and Xenophon's *Cyropedia* 2, 1, 5. At the beginning of the Book of Judith,⁹ we read that Nebuchadnezzar was *King of Assyria in Nineveh*. In the Ethiopic Version¹⁰ of the pseudopigraphic book known as *The Rest of the Words of Baruch*, Nebuchadnezzar is called *nēgdāša Fārēs*, the king of Persia; and at the beginning of the sixth chapter of the Book of Daniel we read

¹ Of Mespila.

² This may mean also *behind it*; cf. *οἱ ἐπὶ πᾶσι*=those who bring up the rear; *οἱ δὲ ταύτῃ*=those who follow.

³ According to Bædeker, *Palästina und Syrien* (Leipzig, 1904), p. 361, it takes about four or five hours to go around the wall of Nineveh.

⁴ Xenophon, it may be supposed, means the castle, i. e. the Acropolis (*Kouyunjik*).

⁵ Nineveh.

⁶ Cf. the Maccabean alphabetical psalm prefixed to the Book of Nahum in which an Israelitish poet (about 606 B.C.) describes the fall of Nineveh; see my paper *Eine alttestamentliche Festliturgie für den Nikanortag* in ZDMG. 61, and my translation of the Book of Nahum in JBL. 26.

⁷ The Book of Judith is a Palestinian, Pharisaic festal legend for the Feast of Purim; see Haupt, *Purim* (Leipzig, 1906), p. 7, l. 38.

⁸ See Dillmann's *Chrestomathia Aethiopica*, p. 6, l. 12; cf. JAOS. 22, 74, n. 2.

that when the last king of the Chaldeans, Belshazzar,¹ was slain he was succeeded by *Darius the Mede*. This statement is due to a confusion of the destruction of Nineveh in 606 and the overthrow of Babylon at the hands of Cyrus in 538, with the conquest of Babylon under Darius Hystaspes in 520.² In the Maccabean sections of the Prophets of the Old Testament *Babel* often stands for *Nineveh* representing Assyria=Syria, *i. e.* the Seleucidan Kingdom.³

Diodorus of Sicily says that there was an old oracle stating that no one would be able to capture Nineveh, unless the river should turn against the city.⁴ It is interesting that Xenophon ascribes the fall of Nineveh to a cataclysm,⁵ and that he refers especially to the queen of the besieged King. The prophet Nahum says in his poetic description of the fall of Nineveh:

The gates of the river are open,
the palace is tottering :
A lake of water is Nineveh,
the flood overwhelms her.

Brought out, a captive, deported
is the King's fair consort ;
Like doves her maidens moaning
and beating their breasts.

See my translation of the Book of Nahum in ZDMG. 61, and JBL. 26.⁶

¹ Belshazzar was not the last king of Babylon, but the son of the last king, Nabonidus (555-538). According to the Book of Daniel, Belshazzar was the son and successor of Nebuchadnezzar (604-561). But Nebuchadnezzar was succeeded by Evil-merodach, 561/0, Neriglissar, 559-6, and Labaši-Marduk, 556/5.

² See Crit. Notes on Daniel (SBOT.), p. 29, l. 15; cf. the confusion of *Abimelech* and *Achish* in the title of Ps. 34.

³ See note 17 to my paper in ZDMG. 61, cited above, p. 100, n. 6.

⁴ Diod. 21, 26, 9 : ἦν δὲ αὐτῷ λόγιον παραδεδωμένον ἐκ προύσων διτε τὴν Νίνον οὐδεὶς ἔλει κατὰ κράτος, ἵνα μὴ πρότερον ὁ ποταμὸς τῇ πόλει γένηται πολέμιος.

⁵ Cf. Diod. 2, 27 : τῷ τρίτῳ δὲ ἔτει συνεχῶς δυμβρων μεγάλων καταρραγέντων συνέβη τὸν Εὐφράτην μέγαν γενόμενον κατακλύσαι τε μέρος τῆς πόλεως καὶ καταβαλεῖν τὸ τείχος ἐπὶ σταδίους εἴκοσιν. *Euphrates* is a mistake for *Khabur*.

⁶ Note the following abbreviations : AJSL.=American *Journal of Semitic Languages*; BA.=Delitzsch and Haupt, *Beiträge zur Assyriologie*; HW.=Delitzsch, *Assyrisches Handwörterbuch*; JAOS.=*Journal of the American Oriental Society*; JBL.=*Journal of Biblical Literature*; JHUC.=Johns Hopkins University *Circulars*; KAT.=E. Schrader, *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*; KB.=E.

Xenophon does not mention the name *Nineveh*. He only names *Larissa* and *Mespila*. Λάρισσα has been explained by Nödeke as a corruption of the Biblical *Resen*, which was situated between Calah and Nineveh. *Larissa* stands for *Narissa*, with *l* for *n*,¹ and this is a transposition for *Russina*, Assyr. *Rēš-ini*, afterwards pronounced *Risin*.² The name *Larissa* may be a Greek adaptation of the Assyr. *Risin*, the Biblical *Resen*, but Xenophon undoubtedly referred to *Calah*, not to *Resen*; so it is a confusion of names, just as he says *Medes* instead of *Assyrians*, and *Persians* instead of *Medes*, and as Diodorus confuses the *Euphrates* with the *Tigris*, and the *Tigris* with the *Khabur*.³

As to Μέσπιλα, it is often said to be an Assyrian word, *mušpilu*, destroyed; but Assyr. *mušpilu* is active, not passive; it means *subduer* not *subdued* or *destroyed*. The passive would be *muštepēlu*. Besides, *šupēlu* (the causative of the intensive stem *ba'ál*, from which the word *belu*, lord, is derived) does not mean *to destroy*, but to *subdue* or *suppress*. The *p* in *mušpelu* represents a partial assimilation of the *b* to the preceding causative *š*, as in *dišpu*, honey, for *dišbu*, in Hebrew transposed: *dēvāš*. According to Schrader (KAT.⁴ 99, below), and Sayce (in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. 3, p. 553, below), Μέσπιλα is the Assyr. *mušpalu*=*dépression de terrain*, low ground; but this explanation is not satisfactory. I believe that *Mespila* represents an Assyrian noun *mušpīlu* derived from the word *pālu* or *pīlu*, which has passed into Greek as *πῶπος*. Greek *πῶπος* denotes a tufaceous limestone resembling marble. Medical writers use the term *πῶπος* for the new growth of osseous tissue between and around the extremities of fractured bones, which we call *callus*. Assyr. *pālu* (or *pīlu*) does not

Schrader, *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*; MDOG.=*Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft*; PSBA.=*Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*; SBOT.=Haupt. *The Sacred Books of the Old Testament*; ZDMG.=*Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*. Cf. below, p. 112, n. 1.

¹ Assyr. *nešu*, lion, appears in Hebrew as *lašš*; beside Heb. *liškā*, cell, we find also *niškā*; see AJSL. 21, 142, n. 24.

² Cf. Haupt, *The pronunciation of tr in Old Persian*, JHUC. No. 59, p. 118; *The Assyr. E-vowel*, pp. 4, 28.

³ See n. 94 to my paper in ZDMG. 61, cited above, p. 100, n. 6.

mean granite, or marble, or alabaster, but shell-limestone.¹ Assyr. *mušpīlu*² may mean a place producing shell-limestone, or a place where shell-limestone is found,³ a designation like the modern Arabic name of Ur of the Chaldees, *Al-Mugājjar*, asphalted, i. e. built with asphalt mortar.

Xenophon says, the *κρηπίς* of Mespila (i. e. Nineveh) consisted of shell-limestone (*λίθος κογχυλιάτης*). This passage has been universally misunderstood. *Κρηπίς* is generally supposed to refer to the base (or plinth) of the wall, but it means also (like Lat. *crepida* in the proverb *ne sutor supra⁴ crepidam*) sole, shoe, and (like Lat. *crepido*) embankment, quay, revetment, retaining wall (Assyr. *kāru*, HW. 349^b), especially the facing or lining of a foss or canal or reservoir with masonry. The meaning *quay, embankment*, is evident in Polyb. 5, 37, 8.

In Polyb. 8, 5, 2 *κρηπίς* denotes the *revetment* (facing of stone) of the sea-wall⁵ on the eastern side of Syracuse. Polybius says that when the Romans besieged Syracuse (213 B.C.) the commander of the fleet, Appius Claudius (Pulcher) decided to attack the (eastern) part of the city known as *Achradina*, at the so-called Scythian stoa where the wall along the sea-shore was built directly on the embankment, i. e. the revetment of the sea-wall, so that there was no foreshore affording a landing-place, in front of the wall. The Roman ships were therefore obliged to approach close to the wall, and the scaling-ladders (*sambukes*) were placed on two ships lashed together, not on the berm in front of the wall. The Roman commander supposed the people of Syracuse, considering this place impregna-


¹ Cf. my paper on the cuneiform name of the cachalot, AJSL. 23, 259, below, and MDOG., No. 26, pp. 35, 58.

² Assyr. *mušpīlu* or *mušpēlū* is a form like *muškēnu*, humble, which appears in Hebrew as *miskēn*, and in French as *mesquin*, mean; see AJSL. 23, 226, n. 18.

³ Cf. the so-called *nomina abundantiae vel multitudinis* in Arabic, e. g. *mármána*, a place where pomegranates (Arab. *rummán*) grow abundantly.

⁴ Not *ultra!* See Plin. *Nat. hist.* 35, 85.

⁵ See the cuts of sea-walls in the *Century Dictionary*, p. 5450, especially cut B. The *facing of stone* (c) is the *κρηπίς*, and the upper perpendicular continuation of the curved *κρηπίς* is the *τεῖχος*.



ble, would perhaps not station a strong force there, so that they might be overpowered by a *coup de main*.

In Herod. 1, 185, 20 *κρηπίς* denotes the embankment of the artificial lake which Queen Nitocris (*i. e.* King Nebuchadnezzar)¹ built below Babylon; *κρηπίς* means here especially the revetment of the walls of the basin with asphalt and burned bricks (Assyr. *inu kupri u agurri*). The Babylonian term for *embankment* is *kibru*, a retaining wall is called *kāru*; see HW. 315^b, 349^b. *Kāru* is connected with *gīr* (KAT.² 516), pitch (originally *bitumen*),³ which appears in Greek as *κηρός*, and *kibru* is the Babylonian⁴ form of *kipru*, which is a byform of *kupru*, asphalt. *Κρηπίς* may be a Greek adaptation of Assyr. *kipru*, *kipir* or *kiper*,⁴ with transposition of *r* and *i*: *kiper*, *kirep*, *krepī*; cf. Arab. *fīṣṣ=ψῆφος*; see Haupt, *Purim* (Leipzig, 1906), p. 45, l. 11 (*fīṣṣ=gif, tsif, tsef, psef*).

In Herod. 2, 170 *κρηπίς* is used for the embankment of the sacred lake at the temple of the goddess Neith, the chief deity of Sais.

The best translation of the cuneiform prototype of *κρηπίς*, *kipru* (*kibru*) is *embankment*, while *kāru* denotes a *retaining wall*.⁵

In German, the bottom of a ditch is called *die Sohle des Grabens*. In French, *escarpe* means *slope* in the sense of an inclined bank of earth on the side of a cutting or embankment, especially (like our *scarp*) the interior *talus* or slope of the ditch of a fortress. *Escarpe*, French *escarpement*, denotes a sharp, steep slope or the precipitous side of a hill or rock,

¹ Nebuchadnezzar says that he surrounded the district of Babylon with great waters like unto the sea, *me rabi'ūtim kīma gībiš tī'amāti māta ušalmī-ma*; see Neb. 6, 41–52; Neb. Grot. 2, 10–14; cf. KB. 3, 2, pp. 22 and 34; PSBA. 10, 115, 222; BA. 3, 532, 546; also R. W. Rogers, *History of Babylonia and Assyria*, vol. 2 (New York, 1900), p. 395, and HW. 10^b, below.

² Heb. *qīr*, wall means originally *built with bitumen*; cf. *Al-Muqdiṣ* and *igaru=agurru* (HW. 18, 19). Assyr. *kīru*, *kāru*=Sumer. *gīr*.

³ See Haupt, *Beiträge zur assyrr. Lautlehre* (Göttingen, 1888), p. 102, n. 3; Delitzsch, *Assyr. Gr.*², § 25, c.

⁴ See Haupt, *The Assyr. E-vowel* (Baltimore, 1887), p. 28; Delitzsch, *Assyr. Gr.*², § 44.

⁵ See MDOG., No. 22, pp. 35, 55; No. 25, p. 59; especially the pictures in No. 26, pp. 24, 38, 48; cf. also *ibid.* p. 36.

while French *escarpin* means *shoe*,¹ especially *pumps*,² just as Greek *κρηπίς* and Lat. *crepida* mean *shoe*. In Latin we have also *carpisculum*, which denotes a kind of shoe, and the architectural term *carpusculum*, foundation, base. *Talus*, slope, means originally *heel, ankle*. Ital. *scarpa* (French *escarpe*) may be an adaptation of *crepido*=*κρηπίς*, connecting it with *scarpellare*, to cut, hew, dig. French *escarpe* is generally supposed to be a Germanic word. Beside MHG. *scharf*, *scharpf* and OHG. *scarf*, *scarpf* we find also *sarf*.

It is not impossible that *pump*, low shoe or slipper, is connected with *pump* (for pumping water). In certain parts of Germany the term *Plunpe* is used instead of *Pumpe*, and *plumpen* or *plumpsen* means, like our *plump*, to fall like a stone in the water, *i. e.* to the bottom. A *Pumpstiefel* means in German a large, clumsy boat. The derivation of *pump*=slipper, from *pomp* is unsatisfactory. *Plump* and *pump* are onomatopoetic, just as *plap*, *plop*, *plash*, *splash*, German *platschen*, *platzen*, *patschen*. The original meaning of *pump* may be *to plump to the bottom*, and *pump*=slipper, may mean originally (like *κρηπίς*=*crepida*) *bottom, sole*; while *to pump* water meant originally *to raise from the bottom*.³ There is evidently some connection between *to plump* and Lat. *plumbum*, lead. *To plump* (just as *to plunge*) may mean originally to fall heavily to the bottom of a well like a piece of lead. A common expression in German for *to sink under the water, to go to the bottom* is *to swim like a leaden duck* (German *wie eine bleierne Ente*).⁴ Cf. also *es liegt mir wie Blei in den Gliedern, bleierne Müdigkeit*, etc., and our *leaden-winged, leaden-paced*, etc. It is possible that Lat. *plumbum* is onomotapoetic; Greek *μόλυβδος* seems to be a loan word.

¹ In English we have *scarpines* as the name of the instrument of torture (resembling the Scotch iron *boog*) used by the Inquisition (in German: *Spanische Stiefel*).

² French *escarpin* is the Ital. *scarpino*; cf. also Ital. *scarpetta* and *scarpettina*. A large shoe is called *scarpone* or *scarpettone*. Ital. *scarpa* means both *shoe* and *slope*=French *escarpe*.

³ Cf. the privative denominative verbs cited in my paper *The Etymology of Mohél, Circumciser*, AJSL. 22, 251.

⁴ Cf. Ex. 15, 10; see my translation of Moses' Song of Triumph, AJSL. 20, 157.

In Xenophon's description of Mespila, *κρηπίς* refers, not to the base of the city wall, but to the moat. The moat of Nineveh is still extant. It is cut in the shell-limestone rock with vertical walls; the width is 150 feet, the depth about 13 feet.¹ It has, of course, been gradually filled up; at the time of Xenophon (401 B.C.) the depth may well have been 50 feet. I believe therefore that Xenophon's statement (*Anabasis* 3, 4) ήν δὲ γε μὲν κρηπίς λίθους ξεστοῦ κογχυλιάτου τὸ εὔρος πεντήκοντα ποδῶν καὶ τὸ ὕψος πεντήκοντα should be translated: The bed of the ditch was of polished shell-limestone,² [1] 50 feet wide, and 50 feet deep.³ Instead of 50 feet wide we must read 150 feet wide. The 50 instead of 150 is due to the statement in the following paragraph where the width of the wall is given as 50 feet. The term *κρηπίς* was misunderstood to refer to the base of the wall; therefore 150 was changed to 50.

The term *κρηπίς*, Lat. *crepida*, sole, bottom, is also at the bottom of the adjective *decrepit*, broken down, especially by age. The original meaning is generally supposed to be *noiseless*, from *de* and *crepitus*, noise, because old people creep about quietly. I believe, however, that *crepitus* is connected with *crepido*, slope, decline;⁴ it means *declined*, i. e. *fallen off*, *sunk to a lower level*, *fallen into an inferior position*; in German: *heruntergekommen*.⁵ We say of a patient suffering from a wasting disease: *he is in a decline*. Cf. also our figurative use of the phrase *to go down the hill*⁶ and *to be taken down* with a fever, etc. The same idea underlies *crepusculum*, twilight, which is said to be a Sabine word. It means originally *declination*, *decline* of the sun, sundown. The use of *crepusculum* for the light of the morning from the first dawn to sunrise is secondary. The proper term for the light from the sky when the sun is below the horizon at morning is *diluculum*. Some philologists connect the adjective *creper*, dark, with *δνοφέρος*,

¹ See BA. 3, 122.

² Cf. above, p. 103.

³ Or *high*; the vertical walls of the moat (*scarp* and *counterscarp*) were 50 feet high.

⁴ In Germany a great many people say *decrepide*, with *d*, instead of *decrepit*; also in English, *decrepit* is often spelled with *d*.

⁵ Our phrase *run down* affords no parallel; this means originally *having its motive power exhausted* like a clock that has run down.

⁶ See Haupt, *Ecclesiastes* (Baltimore, 1905), p. 45, l. 3.

dark, and *κνέφας* (for **κσνέφας*, Sanskrit *kṣáp*, night), darkness; but this is impossible. *Crepusculum*, twilight, and *decrepitus*, in a decline, must be connected with *crepida*, sole, bottom, slope, decline, and in Xenophon's account of the fall of Nineveh *κρῆτις* means, not the *base of the city wall*, but the *bed of the moat*. Greek *κρῆτις*, Lat. *crepido*, *crepida*, *decrepitus*, *crepusculum*, *carpisculum*, *carpusculum*; French *escarpe*, *escarpin*, etc., are ultimately derived from the Assyrian *kipru* (Babylonian *kibru*), embankment, which is connected with the word for asphalt, *kupru*.¹ The root of this stem is *kap*, to rub, to smear, German *streichen*, *schmieren*, originally *to pass the hand* (Heb. *kaf'*) over something; cf. my paper on the Semitic roots *qr*, *kr*, *ər* in AJSL. 23, 241–252 and my book *Biblische Liebeslieder* (Leipzig, 1907) pp. 127–132.

¹ Cf. also French *crépi*, *crépir*.

² Cf. MDOG., No. 12, p. 2; No. 22, p. 47; No. 27, p. 25.

The Etymology of Cabinet.—By PAUL HAUPT, Professor in
the Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

THE term *cabinet* denotes a small room, a collection of objects of art, etc., a piece of furniture with shelves and drawers; also the private apartment of a chief executive (or sovereign) and his advisory council; but the original meaning is: a small temporary habitation. *Cabinet* is a diminutive form of *cabin*, a hut or cottage, which appears in French as well as in early English as *cabane*, with *a* in the second syllable. In later Latin we find *cabanna*, hut of the watchmen in a vineyard;¹ also *capanna*, with *p*. This is evidently a transposition of *canaba*, which means a booth, especially the shop of a sutler following the Roman legions. The *canabae legionum* have been discussed by Theo. Mommsen in *Hermes* 7 (1873) 303, and by J. J. P. Joerensen in his paper *De municipiis et coloniis aetate imperatorum Romanorum ex canabis legionum ortis* (Berolini, 1871). Both papers are cited in Georges' *Latein. Handwörterbuch*, s.v. *canaba* and in Lagarde's *Mittheilungen*, vol. 2 (Göttingen, 1887), p. 365.

Canaba means also a place where wine and oil are stored. In England, *shop* is used instead of *store*, and *shop* is the etymological equivalent of German *Schuppen*, shed. *Shop* denoted originally a booth or stall, as did *canaba*, or, transposed, *cabana*. The word *cabana* appears in various forms: *cannaba*, *canapa*, *canava*, *kanaba*, *canipa*, *caneva*. I am inclined to think that *caupona*, tavern, public-house, is merely another variation of *cabana*. In Greek this word appears as *καπηλεῖον*, and in German as *Kneipe*.

Kneipe means not only a place where university students drink, but also the room in which a student lives; *Bude*, the etymological equivalent of *booth*, is used in the same way. Kluge, in his *Etymolog. Wörterbuch* (Strassburg, 1905), thinks that *Kneipe* in the sense of *den* is not the same word as

¹ Cf. Is. 1, 8 and the illustration on p. 162 in the translation of *Isaiah* in the Polychrome Bible.

Kneipe in the sense of *tavern*; but this view is untenable. Lat. *canaba*, German *Kneipe*, Ital. *cánova*, mean originally simply *booth*, just as *tavern*, Lat. *taberna*, meant originally *booth, shop*; Lat. *taberna* is connected with *tabula*, board. Kluge, following Grimm's *Wörterbuch*, derives *Kneipe* from the Low German *knip*, which means a *trap or snare for birds*, also a house of ill fame; but this uncomplimentary etymology is erroneous: *Kneipe* must be derived from *canipa=canaba*, Greek καπηλεῖον (for *καπανεῖον, *καναπεῖον), although Grimm's *Wörterbuch*, vol. 5 (Leipzig, 1873), col. 1406, states: *Ausser Frage bleibt mittellat. canipa.*

The German verb *kaufen* and the noun *Kaufmann* seem to be connected with Lat. *caupo*. The Gothic form of *kaufen* is *kaupón*, to trade. The English etymological equivalent of *kaufen*, i. e. *cheap*, appears in several place-names in the sense of *market-place*, e. g. *Cheapside*. Originally *cheap* meant simply *trade*; cf. French *bon-marché*. To *chaffer* means to trade; *chapman*=trader, peddler.

In the early Arabic poems تاجر *tájir*, merchant, means especially *wine-merchant*,¹ *taverne*. Arab. كرباج *kúrbaj*=Pers. كلبة *kulbá*² means both *shop* and *tavern*. In Arabic the common term for *shop* is حانوت *hānūt*, and this word has also the special meaning *wine-room, wine-vaults*. Arab. *hānūt* is an Aramaic (or Hebrew)³ loanword; it is connected with the Heb. verb חנה *hanád*, to camp, from which the word מהנה *mahné*, camp, is derived. For the connection of חנה, to camp, with תents, see below, p. 114. Heb. חנות *hanáth* means *vaults of a prison* in Jer. 37, 16. The Authorized Version translates here: *When Jeremiah was entered into the dungeons*⁴

¹ See Georg Jacob, *Das Leben der vorislamischen Beduinen* (Berlin, 1895), p. 99. Arab. *tájir*=Heb. תְּמַקֵּר=Assyr. *tamkaru*; see Crit. Notes on Kings (SBOT.) p. 117, l. 29; contrast S. Fraenkel, *Die aram. Fremdwörter im Arabischen* (Leyden, 1886), p. 181.

² For the final *g* (*j*) in Arabic cf. Haupt, *Purim* (Leipzig, 1906), p. 16, l. 32.

³ The *caupones* were often Jews; cf. Jacob, *l. c.* and Victor Hehn, *Kulturpflanzen und Haustiere*, sixth ed. (Berlin, 1894), p. 71.

⁴ Heb. בֵּית הַבָּזָר means *prison*, not *Brunnenstube*; cf. German *Jemand in's Loch stecken*.

and into the cabins (margin and Revised Version: *cells*). This word חֲנוּת *hanūt* should probably be restored in the passage 2 Sam. 23, 13, where the Received Text reads וְחוּת פָּלָשִׁתִים. **הַנֶּה בָּעֵמֶק רְפָאִים**, generally translated *the troop of the Philistines pitched (Revised Version: were encamped) in the valley of Rephaim*. But the *Vaticanus* has τάγμα τῶν ἀλλοφύλων, and the parallel passage in 1 Chr. 11, 15 reads מַחְנֶה *makhnē*, camp. A Heb. word חֵיה *haïid*, tribe, does not exist; see n. 13 to my paper on Ps. 68, AJSL. 23, 227. In German, *Gewölbe* often means simply *store*, and in English a place where beer and wine are sold is often called *vaults*, no matter whether or not the place is vaulted and subterranean. French *caves* and German *Keller* are used in the same way.

Lagarde showed twenty years ago in the second volume of his *Mittheilungen*, p. 366, that حانوت *hānūt*=Heb. (or حانقة *hanāqat*=*hanayat*, *hanayd*) was the Semitic prototype of Lat. *canava*, *canaba*, *canapa*, *canipa*. A κάπηλος or *caupo* is called in Arabic حانوي *hānayi*=Aram. חַנְוָאָה. Syr. سُلْمَةً. Heb. חַנּוֹנִי. Syr. pl. سُلْمَاتٌ means *booth*, *stall*, *cell*, *arched chamber*; also *gang* or *crew*. The derivation of *Kneipe* from *canipa* (which Lagarde proposed in 1875), has been known for more than sixty years. But no one has called attention to the fact that French *cabane* and English *cabin* are merely transpositions of *canaba*, *caniba*, and that the common expression for *Kneipe* in French, *cabaret*, stands for *cabanet*, just as Greek καπτηλεῖον stands for *καπανέῖον, καβανέῖον. Cabaret for *cabanet* is derived from *cabane*, just as *cabinet* is derived from *cabin*. Lat. *cabana* is a transposition of *canaba*,¹ and *canaba* is derived from a Semitic *hānaya* which we find in Hebrew as *hanā*. The *n* in *hanaya* is a secondary infix; the original root is *hy* or *hm*; cf. Assyr. *emu* (HW. 79^a)=Heb. סָרֵךְ; see AJSL. 23, 228.

Emu=*hamu* (SFG. 26, 3) and *hamu*=*hāyyu* (BA. 3, 580, 34).

So far as I know, no one has suggested a satisfactory etymology of *cabinet* and *cabaret*; but it is evident that French *cabaret* and *cabane*, English *cabin*, *cabinet*, also *chapman* and *cheap*; German *Kneipe*, *kaufen*; Latin *caupona*, *cabbana*, *can-*

¹ We find a similar transposition in βίσων, *bison*=βόνασος, *bonasus*.

naba; Greek καπηλεῖον, are ultimately all derived from the Semitic stem *hanaya* (Heb. חָנַח), to camp. French *cabanage* still means *camp*. In Becherelle's *Nouveau Dictionnaire National* the term *cabanage* is explained as follows: *Lieu ou campent certains sauvages de l'Amérique allant à la guerre ou à la chasse*. For the connection between *Kneipe* and *Kaufmann* we must remember that the German term *Marketender*, sutler (French *viandier*), is etymologically identical with *merchant*: it is derived from Ital. *mercatante*, which Shakespeare uses in the sense of *foreign trader*.

The name Istar.—By PAUL HAUPT, Professor in the Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

THE name of the Babylonian goddess *Istar* appears in Hebrew as אַשְׁתָּרָה, *Ushtrah*, and אַסְתָּרָה, *Ashtorah*. For the ס in אַסְתָּרָה instead of the cuneiform ש see *Crit. Notes on Kings* (SBOT.) p. 270, l. 26. For the initial e in אַסְתָּרָה cf. our *enclose*, *enquire*, etc. = *inclose*, *inquire*, and Heb. אַשְׁתָּרָה = Assyr. *iškaru* (Ps. 128, 3) for אַמְרָתָה, *ākłm*, *āšb̄m*, *āčl̄*, *āšt̄k* (contrast אַמְרָתָה, *ār̄t̄*, *āfr̄t̄*, *āp̄r̄im*, *āb̄yōn*, *āb̄rah* etc.; also אַמְרִי, אַצְבָּע, *ār̄w̄*, *āfr̄t̄*, *āp̄r̄im*, *āb̄yōn*, *āb̄rah* etc.; also אַמְרִי) = Assyr. *itimāli* (for *ittimāli*, *intimāli*) = *ina timāli*; see my paper *The etymology of mohēl, circumciser*, AJSL. 22, 251.¹ *Timāli* is derived from *mālu* (= *ma'dlu*) just as *Tūdnu* (Heb. תֹּהוּם) must be derived from *hom*; see my crit. notes on מֵמִיה יְהוּמָה, *its waters* (viz. of the river Khōsar) *overwhelm her* (Nineveh) Nah. 2, 9 in JBL. 26; cf. also note 96 to my paper *Eine alt-testamentliche Festliturgie für den Nikanortag* in ZDMG. 61.

The second e in אַסְתָּרָה, *Esther* instead of *Istar* is due to vocalic assimilation, as in Assyr. *immeru*, lamb = *immaru* (AG. ^a, § 43, b) = Aram. אַמְרָה — *itpešu*, wise (HW. 119^b; AG. ^a, § 91, No. 40) = *itpašu*; — *ištēn*, Heb. עִשְׂתִּין for עִשְׂתִּי one = *ištān*; see my *Assyr. E-vowel* (Baltimore, 1887) p. 16. It might be well to

¹ Note the following abbreviations:—AG.=Delitzsch's *Assyrische Grammatik*;—AJSL.=American Journal of Semitic Languages;—AL.=Delitzsch's *Assyrische Lesestücke*;—BA.=Delitzsch and Haupt, *Beiträge zur Assyriologie*;—BAL.=Haupt, *Beiträge zur assyr. Lautlehre*, Göttingen 1883;—EB.=Cheyne and Black, *Encyclopædia Biblica*;—HW.=Delitzsch's *Assyr. Handwörterbuch*;—JAOS.=Journal of the American Oriental Society;—JBL.=Journal of Biblical Literature;—JHUC.=Johns Hopkins University Circulars;—KB.=E. Schrader, *Keilinschrifliche Bibliothek*;—OLZ.=Peiser's *Orientalistische Litteratur-Zeitung*;—SBOT.=Haupt, *The Sacred Books of the Old Testament*;—SFG.=Haupt, *Die sumerischen Familiengesetze*;—ZA.=Zeitschrift für Assyriologie;—ZDMG.=Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft;—^{1 2 3 4}=first, second, third, fourth editions, respectively. Cf. above, p. 101, n. 6.

add that according to Glaser, OLZ. 9, 318 **עַשְׂתָּנָם**=*išten* occurs in a South Arab. inscription, and that the stem of *itpešu*, wise, is **אִשְׁבָּאָבֵשׁ=אִשְׁבָּאַפְּשׁ**; cf. Arab. اَحْتَسِبْ. For the partial assimilation cf. AJSL. 22, 202, n. 9; for the transposition, AJSL. 22, 260, n. 10; also 23, 247, below, and Haupt, *Purim*, p. 27, l. 14.

On the same page of my paper *The Assyr. E-vowel*, cited above, I pointed out that *Istar* was a form with infix *t*, like *gitmalu*, *šitrapu*, *mitguru*, etc. We have no right to assume with Delitzsch (AG.², § 91, No. 40) that the *a* in these forms is always long; cf. HW. 154^a. This *a* is just as unwarranted as the *a* in *šikdru*=**שִׁכְרָה**, *zikdru*=**זִקְרָה**, *nikasu*=**נִקְשָׁמִים** (AJSL. 3, 108) or the *a* before the suffixes of the permansive, *kašdāta*, etc. (AG.², § 128). The 1 pers. pl. *kašdāni* for *kašdani* is influenced by the 3 pers. pl. fem. *kušdāni*. Nor can this alleged *a* be identical with the *o* in **סְבֹות** (AG.², § 129, a). The *o* in **סְבֹות** is based on the analogy of the verbs **לְעַזְתָּ**; cf. Arab. *gazayta*. The Qal of the verbs **לְהַשְׁתַּמֵּר** in Hebrew exhibits the intransitive form; see Crit. Notes on Ezra-Nehe-miah (SBOT.) p. 68, l. 22 and the remarks on יְהוָה in the *Verhandlungen des xiii. Orientalisten-Congresses* (Leyden, 1904) p. 261. The transitive form of **גַּלְיָה** would be **גַּלְיִתָּה**, and the transitive form of **גַּלְוָתָה**: **גַּלְיִתָּה**. Heb. **גַּלְיָה** = *galiya*, *galiuta*. Similarly all the Syriac verbs פְּ (except those whose final stem-consonant is a guttural or ר) have in the perf. Qal the intransitive *i*; see Nöldeke, *Syr. Gr.*², § 175, A.

The infix *t* in *Istar* is transposed as in Heb. **הַשְׁתַּמֵּר**, **הַשְׁתַּחֲווּ**, etc. An infix *t* (apart from the cases in which it is due to analogy) must have been originally either prefixed or affixed. In Assyrian we find *tiṣmūr* for *gitmur*; *tizkar* for *zitkar*; *tizqar* for *zitqar*; see Flemming's dissertation *Nebukadnezar II* (Göttingen, 1883) p. 26; cf. AG.², § 57, d. *Zitkar* would have been pronounced *zithkar* with *th*=ש, and *Itšar*: *Ithshar*; see ZA. 19, 235; AJSL. 22, 220, n. 42.

The reflexive *t* (which may be connected with יִתְשִׁיבָּא; see Crit. Notes on Proverbs, SBOT., p. 51; contrast ZDMG. 59, 61) may have been infix first in cases like **הַשְׁתַּמֵּר** and in the conjugation **אַתְּ שְׁפָעֵל** for **אַתְּ שְׁפָעֵל**; afterwards the infixing

was adopted in other cases where there was no phonetic reason for the transposition. While the reflexive **ת** may be connected with **ית=ש**, the causative prefix **ש** may be the remnant of a root meaning *to cause*; cf. Arab. سبب *sabab*, which appears in the Rabbinical philosophical literature as ספָה; the Arabic سبب in سبب, however, represents a **س=ش**, *cause* (=*sababah*). Is an Arabic loanword. Similarly the prefix of the future in Arabic, **و sa** is shortened from سوف *sawfa* (=in the end) and the prefixed م in م اللہ م, *by God* is shortened from ایمن. Also the prefixed ت and و in اللہ و اللہ are remnants of some nouns; see Wright-de Goeje, I, 279, n. *. The ت may represent حیوۃ, and و may be the remnant of an older form of حیت; cf. Crit. Notes on Daniel (SBOT.) p. 28, l. 17; see also my remarks on the stems of حی, *living* (حیوۃ) and حی, συσκρίψια (حوي) in note 13 to my paper on Ps. 68, AJSL. 23, 228. Cf. also *zounds*=*'swounds*=*God's wounds*, etc.

In Ethiopic the reflexive *t* is prefixed; so, too, in Hebrew and Aramaic, except in stems beginning with a sibilant; in Arabic the *t* is infix in the reflexive of the Qal, but prefixed in the reflexive of the Piel; in Assyrian the *t* is infix in both forms. All infixes are due either to analogy or to transposition; cf. my remarks on infixes ת, ד, ג, נ, etc. in my paper on the Semitic roots *qr*, *kr*, *xr* (AJSL. 23) and in the crit. notes on Nah. 3, 10 (JBL. 26). Just as Assyr. *sunqu* is connected with *saqu*, and just as קין appears in Aramaic as חנה, so חנה, *to encamp* may be connected with חות, *tents*; the stem of מחנה, camp, is חנו; the stem of חות is حنو; the root of both stems, however, is حنو; the in حنو is affixed, the in חנו is infix, but originally it was prefixed; so, too, the *n* in ضنك and ضلب.

Arab. حنو is said to mean in the Hudheilian poems *to bend the head to the water, to drink*; but حنو to bend, twist, incline has no connection with חנה, *to encamp*: حنو, *to bend* is derived from the root حن, while حنو, *to drink* (with infix ن, from the root حنو), must be explained in the same way as نهل, *to drink*, which means originally *to halt*; see § 8 of my paper on the Heb. stem נחל, *to rest*, AJSL. 22, 197; cf. also 23, 243.

Twenty years ago (*Assyr. E-vowel*, p. 16) I suggested that the infixated *t* in *Istar* might be, not the reflexive *t*, but the feminine *t*. For this fem. **תִּ** cf. Max L. Margolis, *The feminine ending t in Hebrew* (AJSL. 12, 196-229) and C. Brockelmann, *Die Femininendung t im Semitischen* (Breslau, 1903). See also ZDMG. 57, 628, 795, and my SFG. 6, 1. For the prefixed fem. **תִּ** cf. Lagarde, *Bildung der Nomina* (Göttingen, 1889) p. 125, and Barth, *Nominalbildung* (Leipzig, 1889) p. 274.

While the reflexive-*t* may be derived from **תְּנִשָּׁתִ** (see above, p. 114) the feminine *t* may be connected with Syr. **אַתָּה** áttá, áto, woman (Nödeke, *Syr. Gr.* 2, §§ 26, 146) = *antata*, Assyr. *aššatu*, Arab. **أَنْثَى** *anθá* (SFG. 25, 6). The original form may have been *anθ* (ZDMG. 34, 761). The feminine *t* in Assyr. *aššatu* is secondary, just as in Assyr. *sinništu*, woman, originally *sin-niš*, i. e., month + sick; see AJSL. 22, 256, l. 5; cf. OLZ. 10, 70. In an Assyrian vocabulary the masculine form *iššu* is given as a synonym of *aššatu* (HW. 106^a).

Assyr. *iššu*, woman, may be connected with *enšu*, feeble, weak (HW. 105) = **נִשְׁׂעֵן** 2 S. 12, 15. The stem **נִשְׁׂעֵן** *naš*, to be feeble, **נִשְׁׂאֵל** *niššé*, women, *niš* in Assyr. *sinništu*, Heb. **נִשְׁׂעֵן**, may be allied to the stem of *aššatu*, but **נִשְׁׂעֵן** and **נִשְׁׂעֵן** are not identical: **נִשְׁׂעֵן** has a **שִׁ**, = **שִׁ**, and the plural **נִשְׁׂעֵנִים** has a **שִׁ**, = **שִׁ**. This is the notation which I introduced in SFG. 20, 3; ZDMG. 34, 761; BAL. 100. Delitzsch (AG. 2, § 63=AG. 1, § 46) uses *š₁* for what I termed *š₁*, *š₂* for *š₁*, *š*, for *š₂*; *z₁* for *z₂*, *z₂* for *z₁*; *š₁* for *š₂*, *š₂* for *š₁*, *š₃* for *š₂*. This is very bewildering for the student. Fortunately Delitzsch has not altered my notation for the five Assyrian **נִשְׁׂעֵן**, **נִשְׁׂעֵן**, **נִשְׁׂעֵן**, **נִשְׁׂעֵן**, **נִשְׁׂעֵן**=**אַ**, **שִׁ**, **חִ**, **עִ**, **כִּ**; see SFG. 49; KAT. 2, 492; HW. 1; AL. 4, 151.

Heb. **תְּקַטֵּל**, *thou killst*, was originally *anta+qatal*, and **תְּקַטֵּל**, *she kills*, which is a much later form, may have been originally *antha+qatal*. The form **תְּקַטֵּל** was originally used for both genders; see ZDMG. 34, 757. The **ת** is identical with the **ת** in **הִיא** and Aram. **אֲכֹהֶה**; cf. **בִּרְהִי**=*biráhi*, and Arab. **عَلَيْهِ** *alajhi*, where the *hi* does not represent a vocalic assimilation of *hu*, but the preservation of an old byform of *hu*. The **ת** of **הִיא** appears in the preformatives of the Piel and Shapheph in Assyrian. Arab. **يُعَقَّتِيل**, for Assyr. **uqattil**, is due to the analogy of *jagtul* for *iqtul*. The differentiation of **הִיא** and **הִיא**

is secondary; cf. my remarks on *šā*, *šī*, *šā*, JHUC. No. 114, p. 111^a and JAOS. 22, 48, n. 2; also Crit. Notes on Judges (SBOT.) p. 66, l. 24.

If the infix *t* in *Ištar* be the feminine כַּ, *Ištar* would be equivalent to *Ašratu*, *aširtu*, the Biblical אֲשֶׁרָה, and it might be explained as an old feminine form of the name of the national god of Assyria, *Aššur* or *Ašur*; see Haupt, *Purim*, p. 40, l. 21. The form *Aššār* is later than *Ašur*, just as Aram. קְדִישׁ (Arab. قدوس *qaddūs*) is later than Heb. קְדוֹשׁ, and later than חֲכִים (חֲכָם). In the same way צְדִיק is later than צְרוֹק, and צְרוֹק, from which the name *Sadducees* (Σαδδουκαῖοι, Syr. צְרוֹקִים) is derived, is later than צְדִיק, but older than צְדִיק. As I pointed out in a paper read at the Oriental Congress held at Algiers, the name *Sadducee* 'righteous' is a euphemistic term for 'unrighteous'; the archaic form צְדִיק instead of צְדִיק, it may be supposed, is somewhat sarcastic, just as *gelerht* instead of *gelehrt* in German. The Sadducees were called *righteous*, just as a *blind man* is called in the Talmud סְגִיא נְהֹרָא, or as the *left-hand side* is called in Arabic يَسَارٌ, جَسْرَةٌ, or يَسْرِي, *propitiousness*; cf. Greek εὐώνυμος, and my remarks on the term *clean place* (Assyr. *ašru ellu*, Heb. מִקְוָם טְהֻרָה) for *unclean place* (Heb. מִקְוָם טְמֵא), i. e., *dumping ground*, in JAOS 16, ciii; JBL. 19, 35; also Karl J. Grimm, *Euphemistic Liturgical Appendixes* (Baltimore, 1901) p. 4, and Levy's Talmudic dictionary, vol. 3, p. 351^b.² The Arabic term زَنْدِيق (pl. زَنْدِيقَاتٍ and زَنْادِيقٍ), *heretic, agnostic, infidel, Sadducee, Manichean, etc.*, is the Aramaic equivalent of צְדִיק (צְדִיקָה) with partial assimilation of the initial צ to the following ד, (cf. the remarks on אֲבָשׁ=אֲפָשׁ, above, p. 113) and compensation of the doubling of the *d* by the insertion of an *n* (as in Bibl. Aram. עֲנָרָע for עֲדָע). Arab. *zindiq*=*ziddiq*=*ziddiq*=*zaddiq*=*zaddaq*=*zaduq*. The form *zaduq* is found in the Amarna dispatches (about 1400 B.C.) from Jerusalem (KB. 5, 306, 31). The theory advanced by A. E. Cowley (EB. 4236) that زَنْدِيق

¹ Contrast G. Hölscher, *Der Sadduzäismus* (Leipzig, 1906).

² Cf. A. Fischer's paper on Arab. بَصِيرَةٌ, keen-eyed, per *antiphrasin* = أَعْمَى, blind, in ZDMG. 61, especially p. 427, n. 2, and p. 433, n. 4.

(misprinted زندی) is a Persian word meaning Zoroastrian is untenable. In the Talmud the name *Sadducee*=freethinker has been superseded by the term *Epicurean*; אַפִיקוֹרָא, אַפִיקוֹרֶס, *Epicurean*; see Haupt, *Ecclesiastes* (Baltimore, 1905), p. 6, n. 7.

The name *Aššar* cannot be derived from the Sumerian *Anšar*=Assyr. *kissat šamé*, Heb. צָבָא הַשְׁמִים (KAT.², 351; cf. my remarks in KAT.², 10, 21 and *ibid.* 12, **). *Aššur* is originally not a proper name, but (like *Baal*) a Semitic common noun, meaning *ēquer̄s*, *īlew*; *propitius*, *benignus*; beneficent, benevolent, benignant; cf. חָנֹן, רְחַמֵּן, כָּרוֹשׁ בָּרוֹךְ הוּא, الرَّحْمَان, the καρός περιέργης, ίλεως; propitiatory, propitious; cf. also AG.², § 91, No. 8. The cuneiform ideogram for *Ašur* means *the good or propitious god*, Sumer. *dinger du(g)*=Assyr. *ilu ṭābu* or *ilu dširu*. Beside *Ašur* we find also the form *Ašir* (AL.⁴, 28, No. 228). This Assyrian stem אָשָׁר (*cf.* Heb. אָשָׁר') may be identical with Arab. يَسِّر (*cf.* ZA. 2, 278, 1) and Assyr. יְשַׁר, *to thrive, to prosper* (HW. 310^b). The cuneiform *Ašratu*, *Aširtu* (=אָשָׁרָה) is used, not only as the name of the goddess (KAT.², 432) but also as a common noun with the meaning *sanctuary, shrine, cella*. I pointed out in the Crit. Notes on Ezra-Nehemiah (SBOT.) p. 34, l. 27, that we must read אָשְׁרָנוּ, *sanctuary* instead of אָשְׁרָנוֹ, Ezr. 5, 3, 9. *Ištar* is used as a common noun for *goddess* in Assyrian, while עֲשָׂתָרוֹת צָאן, Deut. 7, 13; 28, 4, 18, 51 means *dams*; *cf.* French *Notre-Dame*=Our Lady, *i. e.*, the Virgin Mary,¹ and נָשָׂרָה *dam=queen* (*Crit. Notes on Ezra-Nehemiah*, SBOT. p. 67, l. 12) also *sire* (male parent of a beast)=*Sire*; *see my notes on Nah. 2, 8 in JBL. 26*. I believe therefore that *Aššur*, אָשָׁרָה, *Ištar*, are all derived from the Semitic stem يְסַר (=אָשָׁר) *to be propitious, benignant*, and that these names are originally not *nomina propria*, but *appellativa*; *cf.* Haupt, *Purim* (Leipzig, 1906) p. 13, l. 10; p. 40, l. 22.

The נ in Aram. אֲנָהָר and the ש in Arab. אַשְׁר do not prove the ש of Assyr. *Ašur* to be a ש, (ZA. I, 273). We find an Aramaic נ and Arab. ش for Assyr. š in Assyr. *paššaru*, dish, table, Aram. פֶּשְׂרָא, Arab. فَسْرَعْ ; but Assyr. *paššuru* is a

¹ Istar is the prototype of the Madonna; we have several terra-cotta figures of Istar with a baby on her left arm; see KAT.³, 429, 5.

Sumerian loanword=Sum. *banšur*; see BA. I, 162, below, and 181, n. **; Crit. Notes on Proverbs (SBOT.) p. 51, l. 14; cf. also KAT.¹, 420, 6; 421, 6. For اُفَرْ = عَفَرْ see Lagarde, *Mittheilungen*, vol. I (Göttingen, 1884), p. 76; cf. my remarks on Assyr. *erēšu*, to be fragrant=عَرْفَ in AJSL. 23, 250, below. For Ἀφροδίτη=עַשְׁתָּרָת see Hommel, *Aufsätze und Abhandlungen* (Munich, 1892), p. 34.

According to KAT.², 421, 7; 425, 1; 431 the stem of *Ištar* may be حَشَرْ, *to assemble* (جَمِيع), so that *Ištar* would mean מִפְקָר צְבָא (Is. 13, 4) *who musters the host of heaven, who reviews the stars*, just as we find in Is. 40, 26 that JHVH is the מְרוֹצֵא בְמִסְפֵּר צְבָא. This verse should be preceded by vv. 18, 22; see my translation of Is. 40 in Drugulin's *Marksteine* (Leipzig, 1902). *Ištar*-Venus as morning-star and evening-star is the leader of the stars. In Mandaic, עַשְׁתָּרָא אֲסֻחָּרָא is used for the planet Venus (Syr. آسخارا). This etymology of *Ištar*, however, seems rather artificial; besides, it would be difficult to account for the infix *t*, unless we explain it as the feminine *t*; the forms with infix reflexive *t* (see above, p. 113) are all intransitive. Zimmern (KAT.³, 425) raises the question whether the Indo-European word for star, Greek ἀστέρις, may be derived from *Ištar*. The similarity of the Indo-European words, however, may be merely accidental.¹

The *U* in עַשְׁתָּרָת does not prove that the first stem-consonant was an *Y*, just as the *U* in عنور (see above, p. 117) and South Arab. عنتر does not show that the *U* was a *U*. In certain Assyrian loanwords we find in Hebrew an *Y* instead of *N*, e. g., in the numeral עַשְׁתָּה = Assyr. *ištēn* (see above, p. 112), = Sumer. *aštān*.¹

The Masoretic punctuation עַשְׁתָּרָת is a *Qeret perpetuum*, suggesting the substitution of בְּשָׁתָּה for עַשְׁתָּרָת; see KAT.¹, 435, 5; Crit. Notes on Kings (SBOT.) p. 294, l. 28; Ges.-Kautzsch, § 95, q, n. 1. The correct vocalization would be עַשְׁתָּרָת = *Aštārt*, Greek Ἄστρατη. In a cuneiform treaty between Esarhaddon (681–668 B.C.) and Baal of Tyre the Phenician עַשְׁתָּרָת appears as *Astartu* (KAT.¹, 434, 4) with

¹ Cf. Moses Schorr, *Altbabylonische Rechtsurkunden* (Vienna, 1907), p. 163, n. *; cf. *ibid.* p. 208.

Assyr. *s=שׁ* (see Crit. Notes on Kings, SBOT., p. 270, l. 26) just as Phenician קְרַת חֶרְשָׁת, *New City*, appears in an inscription of Esarhaddon (KB. 2, 148, 23) as *Qarti xadasti* (genitive) with *s=שׁ*; cf. BAL. 109. *Qart hadasat* became *Qart hadšā*; with the Phenician obscuration of the *ā*: *Qart-hadšō*, *Carthago* (with *ח*, English *j*). In Greek Καρχηδών both the *t* and the *š* were elided; cf. my remarks on the *scriptio plena* of emphatic *ל* in Hebrew, OLZ. 10, 308. The *η* in Καρχηδών stands for *a*; cf. Ξέρξης=Ξήρξης=Ξαρξας=Khšayāršā; Πέρσαι=Πηρσαι=Πάρσαι=Pārsa; see Haupt, *Purim* (Leipzig, 1906) p. 23, l. 10.

The final ת in עֲשֶׂתֶרֶת is secondary just as in Assyr. *Ištaritu*; cf. Crit. Notes on Kings (SBOT.) p. 270, l. 32 and above, p. 115. But the ש in עֲשֶׂתֶרֶת is more primitive than the ס in אֲשֶׁר: the name עֲשֶׂתֶרֶת represents a late form.

Another name of *Ištar* is *Nand'a*; see Crit. Notes on Kings (SBOT.) p. 283, l. 27. According to 2 Macc. 1, 16 Antiochus Epiphanes (175–164 B.C.) and his attendants were struck down with stones in the temple of *Nanaa* in Persia, hewed in pieces, and their heads cast to those who were without; cf. Judith 14, 1; 2 Macc. 15, 35. Judith is a Palestinian, Pharisaic festal legend for the Feast of Purim, while Esther is a Persian, Sadducean legend for this purpose. Also Ecclesiastes and Jonah are Sadducean books, but the corrective glosses in Ecclesiastes are Pharisaic; see Haupt, *Ecclesiastes* (Baltimore, 1905), p. 2, and my paper on Jonah's Whale in the *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 1907.

We may say therefore that the name *Esther* has no connection with the Indo-European words for *star* (cf. *Stella*, *Estelle*, etc.) but represents a later form of Assyr. *Ištar* which seems to be an old feminine form of *Ašur*, from אֲשֶׁר (= אֲשֶׁר) *to be benignant*, so that *Esther*=*Ištar* would mean *benigna*; cf. Lat. *Bona Dea* and the names *Bona*, *Agatha*, *Clementine*, *Beatrix*, etc.

The Sniff-kiss in Ancient India.—By E. WASHBURN HOPKINS,
Professor in Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

THE fact that kissing is unknown to various races has long been recognized. The Mongols, for example, and many Polynesians and Negroes do not kiss, while the Eskimos are said to kiss not as a mark of affection but only as a prophylactic against disease; but the Eskimo kiss is really only an inhalation of breath or a sniff, and the practice of sniffing to insure health is one not confined to savages. Instead of kissing, rubbing noses (called hongi) is the Malay and Polynesian substitute, but among the African Negroes it is customary to show affection by means of a vigorous sniff. Thus Miss Kingsley, in her *Travels in West Africa*, p. 478, records that her especial Negroes even "sniff frequently and powerfully at the body" of a dead relative, and "the young children are brought and held over it, so that they can sniff too."

Other examples of savage custom in this regard have been given by Nyrop in his little book, *The Kiss and its History*, in the last chapter of which he discusses the "Malay kiss," that is the nasal salutation, as described by Darwin, Spencer, and other observers, including the observations of Timkowski, who "writes of a Mongol father that the latter time after time smelt his youngest son's head." On the North-east frontier of India, as noticed in the work of Nyrop and also in the *Things Indian* of William Crooke, people do not kiss but sniff at or smell each other. For example, the Kyoungtha of the Assam frontier employ the nose for kissing; they do not say "give me a kiss" but "smell me."¹ Nyrop, however, has nothing to say of India proper, and Balfour's *Cyclopedia of India*; ii, p. 579, except for a reference to Wilson's *Hindu Theatre*, states only that kissing is unknown to several races on the North-western frontier, notably the Karen and Shen races, and to the wild tribes of Arakan in Burma. But Wilson himself brings us a little nearer to the Hindu point of view in stating that smelling for kissing is "still common" in India.

¹ Crooke, op. cit., p. 188.

We may start with the assumption that there was a primeval barbarism to which kissing was unknown, for the reason given by Tylor's friend (*Primitive Culture*, i, p. 63), namely, that if people had ever known so agreeable a practice they could never have forgotten it; or, if this is not sufficient, the absence of the practice among savages and the cult of kissing among civilized people of the highest class may serve as an indication of the course of development. At any rate, it is this state which is actually represented in the older literature of India. The Vedic poets have no real word for kiss but employ instead a word meaning "sniff" or "smell." Even the complete parallel with the action of animals is recognized in the literature, and we are told that after God made his creatures they suffered and he comforted them, "sniffing at them" as cows or horses sniff at their young.¹ The cow's recognition of its calf by means of smelling is even brought into direct relation with the sniff given to the new-born child by its father. The Domestic Regulations—manuals of family law—prescribe that the father shall "thrice sniff at the head" of the infant, as a cow sniffs at the calf, and this is coupled with the mystic "doctrine of breaths," the idea that sniffing at the child "insures long life," a doctrine that may be found as far back as the age of the Upanishads.² Also when returning from a journey a father does not kiss but "sniffs at the head of" his children,³ and in doing so he shall "low like a cow"; otherwise he shall ignore them altogether; but whenever he greets them it is with a sniff.⁴

¹ Compare the passages: *Satapatha Brähmana*, 4. 5. 5. 11; 5. 1. 4. 15; 18. 5. 1. 16; and also 7. 3. 2. 12. Further, *Āitareya Brähmana*, 1. 7 and *Tāndya*, 7. 10. 15. Cattle, it is said, are made to see and recognize by sniffing, *Sat. Bräh.* 4. 5. 8. 5; 11. 8. 8. 10. "Smell" and "breathe in" (sniff) are exchangeable terms, the idea being that "one smells by breathing in," *BAU*. 1. 3. 8; 3. 2. 2.

² Compare on this point the *Śāṅkh. House-Rules*, 1. 24. 2; those of *Āpastamba*, 1. 15. 12; *Pāraskara*, 1. 16. 10-16; *Āśvalāyana*, 1. 15. 9; *Khādira*, 2. 3. 13.

³ *Pārask.* 1. 8. 3; *Gobh.* 2. 8. 21-22; and *Kāuś. Upanishad*, 2. 11 ("touch" and "sniff at" are here alternate readings).

⁴ The earlier rule is given in the *Satapatha Brähmana*, 2. 4. 1. 14; *Kāty. 4. 12. 23* (VS. 3. 41-43). Here no greeting at all is recognized; but it does not necessarily follow that none is to be given, only that the earlier author did not think it worth while to prescribe a rule.

Even after a real kiss-word appears, which is not till quite late, the word for sniff and presumably the action corresponding to the word is still used, and what is quite strange, both the word for sniff and the word for kiss appear at bottom to mean "touch." In a certain early passage the corpse is said to be carried past the fire so as to be "smelt" by the flame, but an alternative version substitutes "touched" (SB. 12. 5. 1. 13; Jāb. Up. 4; ĀB. 7. 2). And just as the origin of sniff is thus illustrated by its synonym, so the meaning of the later word for kiss, cumb, is shown by its affinity with cup, "move," "touch." Moreover, although the "deadly kiss" of a fair maiden is not unknown to Hindu folklore,¹ it cannot be supposed that kissing was ever regarded as so deadly an operation that the same word was also used in the meaning "kill." Yet this is another meaning assigned to cumb. The explanation is easy enough, however, if it is regarded as a divergent growth from the same radical idea "touch," for words of this significance often take on a grim sense. Thus in Latin, tango is also a synonym of kill and our English Bible has "touch" in Genesis xxvi. 29, "we have not touched thee," in the sense of injure; while "fasten upon," "attack" (attach), and Greek ἄπτωμαι all serve as illustrations of the same growth.

It is seldom that the word "smell," "sniff," is found in its original meaning of "touch," so it is important to observe that this meaning may be that of Atharva Veda, 12. 4. 5, where it is associated with the word mouth. As no one smells with the mouth the word may here mean touch, as it probably does also in the Rig Veda 1. 185. 5, "touching the navel of the world." In the former passage, however, "snuff at with the muzzle" may be the sense, if, as is doubtful, the words refer to a cow. But the original meaning is sufficiently established by the connection of this root, ghrā, with the Greek χράω, "scrape," and with Sk. ghars, "rub."

¹ An early illustration of the deadly kiss may be found in Jātaka 93, p. 389: Here a lion who loves a doe dies of licking her poisoned body, balavasinehena tassā sarīrah lehitvā, and thus points a moral:

na vissase avissatthe, vissatthe pi na vissase,
vissāsā bhayam anveti siham va migamātukā,

"One should not trust the one unworthy of trust nor even the one who is trustworthy," etc.

The sniff-kiss is constantly represented as not only a means of recognition but also of delight. We have seen cows and horses compared with men in this regard, but India adds another example, not so familiar to our experience, in the epic description of an elephant exhibiting joy at its master's return by sniffing at his feet (*Mbh.* 13. 102. 58). That even in this generation people as well as animals are capable of identifying others by their individual odor is well known and it is very likely to this that reference is made by Kālidāsa when he says:

Savvo sagandhesu vissasadi,

“Every man has confidence in those of the same smell.”¹

It is not till the close of the Vedic period, some centuries before our era, that we find any mention of kissing, and even then there is no word to describe the act, only an awkward circumlocution. In a supplement to the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (= BAU. 6. 4. 9 and 21), kissing forms part of a love-passage between man and wife, where the situation is quite intimate, and is described as “setting mouth to mouth.” It is important as explaining the circumstances in which a kiss is recognized as *en règle*. The husband at the same time strokes his wife, a point to which we shall return later.

The next situation in which kissing is described presents the picture of a man “drinking the moisture of the lips” of a slave-woman, which certainly implies something more than sniffing at her. It is found in the oldest metrical Dharmasāstra, and the action of a man who thus drinks the moisture (foam) of a slave’s lips is severely reprobated (*Manu*, 3. 19).

In the great epic of India, however, we have by far the best description of kissing, when a young man thus tells what happened to him the first time a girl embraced him. He was the son of an anchorite and had not enjoyed a young man’s usual privileges, so it was a novelty to him to be embraced, and

¹ Śak. p. 68. This is usually translated “has confidence in his own relatives,” which gives the sense but not exactly, because *gandha* means smell and never means a relative. Smell is frequently used, as in English “smell of the lamp,” to indicate likeness of a sort, in Sanskrit rather a remote similarity or even so remote as to be only an imitation. Thus one whom we should term a “brother only in name” (not a true brother), the Hindu calls “a brother only in smell,” not as in our ballad poetry “Thou smell of a coward, said Robin Hood,” but implying a negation, a false brother.

he told his father about it, without consciousness of committing an indiscretion, in these words: “(She) set her mouth to my mouth and made a noise and that produced pleasure in me” (*Mahābhārata*, 3. 112. 12). The expression is quaint but the description “set mouth to mouth” is identical with that of the formal description used above and was evidently the best way known at this time of saying “kiss.” This is an argument against the very great antiquity of the Buddhist Birth-stories (*Jātakas*), for in these tales the later word for kiss, cumb, is well known. But there is another bit of historical illumination in the usage of the *Jātakas*. It will have been noticed that the sniff-kiss in all the examples hitherto given is an expression of affection between members of the same family, more particularly between parents and children, and that on the other hand mouth-kissing occurs between man and woman only. Men do not kiss each other on the mouth but on the cheek, neck, or forehead, even after the discovery of the mouth-kiss. Even in our day in Southern India kissing is a family ceremony confined to persons of the same sex, as was observed long ago by the Abbé Dubois (chapter xiv). On the other hand, in Vātsyāyana’s Love-aphorisms (ii, 3,) where only kissing between the sexes is under consideration, the sniff-kiss is ignored, though every variety of real kisses is treated, even including the double-tongue kiss mentioned by Plautus, *Asin.*, 3. 3, *duplicem ut habeam lingnam*.

Now in the Buddhist *Jātakas* not only is the real kiss known but it is exchanged between mother and son. Here however a distinction must be made. The real kiss is given with the mouth, but it may be implanted upon the mouth, head, hand, etc. The Buddhist mother kisses her son, but she kisses him upon the head, and in addition, as the head is the place devoted to the earlier greeting, also “smells his head.”¹

The word cumb in its more modern forms, cum, tsum, and sum, has become the regular word for a lip-kiss in Northern

¹ *Jātaka*, No. 532 (p. 828): *sīsaṁ ghāyitvā cumbitvā*, “smelling and kissing the head,” as the mother embraced, ālingitvā, her son. In No. 6 (p. 129), cumb alone is used (*roditvā sīse cumbitvā*) of a king embracing his son, and “kissing his head.” Here also, No. 266 (p. 339), sniffing alone is used of a horse sniffing affectionately at an ass’s body (*upasainghamāno*).

India but is today still united with "licking" as well as with "smelling." In the Lucknow dialect, one says "kissed and licked"; in Bengali, "eat a kiss." The usual North Indian term for kissing is "tasting a kiss," though, as with us, a kiss is also "given," but is quite as often "made" or "tasted."

If we drew the general conclusion that the real (*cumb*) kiss was unknown in early India and that the sniff (*ghrā*) kiss gradually gave way to the kiss-as-we-understand-it, we should but put into historical terms the data of Hindu literature. There might however be made one objection to such a conclusion which may be thus formulated. Is it not possible that both methods of salutation were known in antiquity but that only one happened to be registered in the earliest literature? The one thus registered would naturally be that exchanged between relatives, the less emotional sniff rather than the amorous lip-kiss. In reply it may be said that amorous situations are plentiful enough in the early literature, but for all that there is no mention of a real kiss. To be sure, there is a word which some translators, ignorant alike of the history of kissing and the true meaning of the word, render "kiss," but that is only because they see that the situation demands something of the sort and they do not know how else to render it. It never occurs to them that the literal meaning "touch," "lick" "sniff" can apply to an amorous situation, and yet these are the meanings of the words. Sometimes one sniffs at the beloved object and sometimes one licks the object of affection, but neither of these words should be translated "kiss." Nor does "approach" justify the rendering "kiss." A few examples will make these points clear.

In the Rig Veda there is a verse cited in a later Brähmana. The first is translated by Grassmann and the second by Eggeling, and both render the Vedic text as "the bards kiss him like a child," whereas the word employed in the original not only means "lick" but is the very root of our English "lick," namely *rih* or *lih*. In this, as in all similar cases, there is only the licking which shows a cow's affection for her calf or marks the action of the Fire-god as he licks the fuel. That this word is generalised into a word for caress merely shows the lack of a better word for an idea also lacking.

The metaphorical language of the Vedas sometimes obscures this point. For example, in one passage we read that the "young lord of the house repeatedly licks the young woman" and it is not surprising that the shocked translators render this as "kisses his bride." Now bride is quite correct; the "young woman" is a bride, but lick is the proper word for *rih* as here used, since the young lord is no other than the Fire-god and the bride is the oblation poured in sacrifice upon the fire, a perfectly natural word to use in connection with fire licking the oblation. So, not to give more examples of the same sort, in every case where this word is rendered kiss either by the translators or by the lexicons it really means lick and is applied to the tongues of fire, cows, or horses, or to licking the inside of a vessel.¹

The fact that the Vedic bards "caress (lick) with song" must be kept in mind in interpreting such a passage as Rig Veda 1. 186. 7, a very important verse because the word lick is here united with a word which has also suffered the same fate of having a more modern thought read into it. This is the word *nas*, "go to, approach, caress," and because of this last vague meaning often but erroneously rendered as indicating specifically a kiss. On the contrary, the word is used particularly of women going to their husbands, as it is in the present instance, where the obvious meaning is "the songs go to him as wives to their husbands," after it has been stated that "the songs, like cows, lick (caress) the youthful god." But more important is the fact that still another word derived from this *nas* is also to be interpreted in the same way. This is the word *nīns*, which, like others of its ilk, has passed from the meaning "go to" to that of "approach, touch, embrace," and is often given

¹ The passages here referred to are Rig Veda 10. 128. 1; Śat. Brāh. 4. 2. 1. 10; RV. 1. 140. 9; 1. 146. 2; 10. 45. 4; 10. 79. 3; and especially RV. 10. 4. 4; AV. 11. 9. 15. Compare also Śat. Brāh. 6. 7. 3. 2, where the words of the Rig Veda in regard to the fire "licking the earth and sky" are transferred to the rain-god; Rig Veda 10. 162. 4, where licking indicates the caress of an evil spirit; and ib. 1. 22. 14, where lick is used as a general word for caress, "caress with song." So in VS. 2. 16; ŚB. 1. 8. 3. 14. With the transfer of this word (appropriate to cows) to human affections may be compared the use of the word *vatsalayati*, a causative from the notion of acting like a cow toward the calf (*vatsa*), in the sense of "make yearn after."

the false meaning "kiss," though "greet" is the nearest approximation to such a sense to be found in the earliest literature. Thus in the Rig Veda 9. 85. 3, the poets are said to "sing to Soma (the god) and greet (surely not "kiss") the king of the world." Again, ib. 10. 94. 9, the musical notes of the grind-stones "greet the steeds" of the god who comes to drink the beverage they are preparing. In 10. 76. 2, "the call reaches the sky and touches the earth" is the meaning of a verse absurdly translated "kisses the earth," as in 10. 92. 2 "greet the fire" and not "kiss the fire" is the true meaning. Of course there are passages where "kiss" is not so absurd a rendering, as in 8. 43. 10, where the ray of light is said to "touch the spoon's mouth" and may conceivably be thought to kiss it; as conversely, in 1. 144. 1, the spoons themselves "touch the seat of fire," where also "kiss" is not incongruous. Yet a principle of interpretation which allows in passages of no value a meaning inconsistent with that necessary in passages of great significance, is not one to be relied upon and is in fact a source of error. "Touch" leads to "taste" (as English "taste" means originally "touch"), and "taste" is a later meaning of *niñs*, yet even the native commentator renders the word by "approach" rather than "kiss" in some of the Vedic passages; but, as he is of a later age, he tends to make the same mistake as is made by scholars of today and sometimes reads into the word the later idea. In form, *niñs* is simply a reduplicated *nas* and so etymologically, as was shown above, means no more than "approach," as has long been recognized by Sanskritists.¹

It is an interesting fact that some English words for "kiss" have parallels, etymological and other, in the modern languages of India. One of these is the good old English "buss" and its learned cousin-word "bass," which as late as Chaucer appears as "ba," "Let me ba thy cheke." Those are the Western representatives of the Persian and Hindustāni words *būsa* and

¹ Compare Bartholomae, in Kuhn's *Zeitschrift*, 29, p. 488. In addition to the examples already given, compare Rig Veda 4. 58. 8, "streams of ghee approach the kindling-wood," where *nas* is translated "kiss" by Grassmann. That the same word should mean caress, fondle, flatter, and kiss is not strange. Greek πονητεω means "applaud" as well as "kiss."

bôsa, which in the dialects of Northwestern India have gone through similar changes and appear today as bus, bas, bes, bui, bai, and ba.¹

Another coincidence is that on the Northwestern frontier of India the word kuś appears in the sense of the German kuss, our kiss. This I am inclined to refer etymologically to the Sanskrit kuś, which has a variant form kus, and to connect it with our English "hug."²

It should cause neither doubt nor surprise that a word meaning hug or embrace eventually becomes equivalent to "kiss." The Greek language offers analogies. Notably is this the case with *προστίθομαι* (*στόμα*). In Homer this word means "welcome" and "address" and "greet" (with a word); then in the

¹ In the form bui this word must be distinguished from bui, "smell," not another case of the sniff-kiss, however, since the latter is a corruption of budh (baoidē) "perceive." The Latin basium, from which English bass, ba, are derived, is not early Latin, and is probably a soldier's or trader's word brought from the East, rather than, as some have supposed, a word imitative of the sound of kissing. English buss is old German bus (used by Luther) and has been derived tentatively, but too hastily, I think, from a Celtic word for mouth (Johansson in KZ. 36. 355). It is curious that maccha, a Hindu word for kiss, is almost identical with the word for fish, and that the symbol of Love in India has been for a long time a fish, as if there were a play upon a word not easily symbolized in any other way. But it is perhaps more probable that maccha, like English "smack" (a blow or a kiss), is an imitation of sound. Dr. Grierson, the learned editor of the Linguistic Survey of India, in which will be found the forms cited here and below (*Survey of the N. W. Frontier*), has been kind enough to furnish me with two Hindustāni baby-words of the same sort. These are "babbf" and "bukki," meaning kiss, and apparently used as imitative words.

² In the same way, perhaps, "gaft goft," translated "embraced and kissed," may revert to gava, "hand, hold." It is interesting to see that cumb appears in the border-land vernacular not only as cum but also as cup (transcribed tsum and tsup), as if still preserving its connection with Sk. cup, "touch." As for kuś, it would correspond to Sanskrit kukṣi and kośa, the root appearing in double form, as kuś and as kus (cf. MS. 1. 4. 18 and Nir. 1. 15, cukośa). The Pushto kush-al (cf. kar-al, "doing") has shorter forms, but the word is always differentiated from khashólf, "merriment," which comes from a different root (compare Horn, *New-Pers. Etymol.*, No. 508). The short forms of kush-al will be found scattered through the pages of *Ling. Surv. N.W. Frontier*, pp. 38, 46, 178, 184, 267, 288, 298, 309, 380. Kuś : hug :: kalya : hail, and kuś : hug :: paś : fügen.

drama it is associated with "mouth," and becomes "kiss." We may compare also the use of other Greek words, such as *ἀσπάζομαι*, *προσβολή*, *ἀμφιπίττω*, etc., which are associated with and eventually express kissing. The close approach of the meanings of Greek *φιλέων* and Sanskrit *jus* is also to be noticed. The latter (German *kiusan*, Latin *gusto*) means, as a middle and causative verb, "take delight in," *liebkosen*, and the Vedic poet says "Delight in our song as a lover delights in his girl," Rig Veda 3. 62. 8 (cf. 52. 3). This brings us close to *φιλῶν* "love," and *φιλημα* "kiss," but not quite so close as the Rājasthāni equivalent of this very Greek word *φιλημा* brings us, when *piār*, Hind. *piyār*, containing the root of *φιλημα*, is also "love" and "kiss."

Before examining the substitutes for kissing recognized in ancient India, it would be worth while to inquire whether the results thus far gained from our study accord with the evidence found not among savages but among other Aryan peoples. The Romans, of course, had the mouth-kiss, as is shown by the word *osculum*, "little mouth"; but it must be remembered that Roman civilization is comparatively recent as contrasted with that of Greece and India. Kissing on the mouth seemed to the Greeks rather an Oriental custom, and Herodotus says that the Persians thus saluted social equals, while inferiors received a cheek-kiss (*Hd.* 1, 134). Now among the ancient Greeks of Homer's day there was real kissing; but no case of kissing on the mouth is recorded either in the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey*, although people are spoken of as kissing the hands, knees, shoulders, and eyes.¹

As to the method of salutation among the ancient Celts and Germans we know nothing at all,² so that there is no strong evidence against and some evidence in favor of the theory that the Indo-Europeans were originally without the benefit of kissing, and like so many other savages smelt or sniffed as a sign of

¹ *Ling. Surv. N. W. Frontier*, p. 14.

² It is possible that kissing on the mouth was reserved for amorous passages. No women are kissed at all in Homer's poems; but this latter fact would seem to make the assumption improbable, since amorous passages are not lacking. Prof. Seymour's forthcoming *Homeric Age* gives all the necessary data on this subject.

³ Compare Schräder, *Real-Lexicon*, p. 312.

affection, perhaps with the idea of inhaling the spirit or soul of the beloved, or possibly because, with keener nerves and beastlier joys, it really was a pleasure to smell the object of recognition and affection. That phase of the question must be left to others more familiar with the interpretation of such problems, and they perhaps will also be able to say what is the origin of the true mouth-kiss, whether tasting or biting or licking. Love-bites are frequently referred to in Sanskrit literature. At a late date the Hindu poets refer to kissing of the lips as the drinking of honey. Thus the king in the sixth act of the drama of *Śakuntalā*, at a time when real kisses were given, says to a bee: "O bee, if thou touchest (kispest) the dear one's lip once drunk in feasts of love by me," and at a still later date "lip-drinking" is a poetical paraphrase for kissing. It is important for the estimation in which kissing was held to remember that on the Hindu stage everything of an unaesthetic sort was strictly forbidden. So no murder may occur in sight of the spectators, and there may not be exhibited any scenes of "scratching or kissing." But, although kisses are not given on the stage, they may yet be referred to, and so the king in the drama just cited speaks of the fact that he did not "kiss her (the heroine's) mouth," using the now familiar word cumb.

In the literature of the middle period, between that of the Vedic age and that of the dramatic period, say about the second or third century B.C., the sniff-kiss is still closely connected with the embrace of affection. "The king, delighted and full of affection, sniffed at his son's head and embraced him," is a passage of the great epic which illustrates this point as well as the following words: "Filled with the greatest affection, Kuntī sniffed at the head of her daughter-in-law, while Krishnā (another female relative) embraced her." Also when two men part they embrace and may sniff at each other, if closely connected; but the more respectful salutation is to bow, circumambulate (to the left), and kiss the feet. Sniffing at the head and embracing is part of a fond mother's farewell. Incidentally it may be observed that besides bowing with the head (either with or without the hands "in lotus-formation" pressed to the brow), the early salutation consists in "bending the knee," a greeting as old as the Vedic age. The right knee is bent by an inferior but important person, the left by a

lowlier one; both knees by the lowliest; and to this was added prostration as a sign of greatest humility; but to the glory of the Aryan be it added that he never prostrated himself, even to his gods, till long after he became a victim to the enervating climate of India. By the time of the epic poetry there was even "the prostration with eight members" in distinction from the less humble "five-membered prostration."¹

As the examples have shown, the sniff-kiss is preëminently the token of family love and chaste affection given by a friend to a friend of the same sex or by older people to children. Unfamiliar, and even to our minds somewhat disgusting, the pleasure derived therefrom is no matter of theory, as witness such an incidental (and hence the more valuable) statement as this from the great epic:² "Men who have gone to another town rejoice when children (sons) climb to their lap (hip); and they sniff lovingly at their heads." When the great hero Arjuna greets his beloved son, who has died and been resurrected, he thus embraces and "sniffs at his head." A typical case may be found in another place, where a king gives permission to his nephews to depart and embraces them. They then get leave of the queen and embrace her feet. Finally their mother sniffs at them and embraces them (this means that she puts her hands about their faces or her arms around their necks), and they again circumambulate the king, being careful to keep the right hand toward him, as a last token of esteem. In the bitterest sorrow, a bereaved widow is represented in epic poetry as sniffing at the corpse of her dead husband, the bereaved mother as sniffing at the body of her son slain in battle, and, exactly like the negroes described by Miss Kingsley, the mourners even sniff at the face of the dead.³

¹ On these points and for an account of the curious crossed-legged kneeling of a king at his inauguration, known as "making a lap," the following passages should be consulted: Mahābhārata 1. 74. 120; ib. 221. 21 and 22; ib. 14. 53. 2 (52. 30 and 53); Rāmāyana, 2. 25. 40; Śat. Brāh. 2. 4. 2. 1 and 2; Āit. Brāh. 8. 6 and 9; and the Rig Veda, 1. 72. 5 and 10. 15. 6.

² Mahābhārata, 1. 74. 61.

³ Compare the scenes in the great epic at 14. 80. 56; 15. 86 (to verse 49); and for sniffing at the face, *vaktram upāghṛāya*, ib. 11. 17. 28; 20. 6. A note on how a child is carried may be of interest. Above I have translated "climb to the lap"; this is literally "to the hip." But the child is

When Medea parts in despair from her children she exclaims, "O delicate skin and sweetest breath of children." The Hindu, from the earliest times, expresses his appreciation of the touch of the beloved object, whether wife or child. And conversely, not the father's and husband's kiss but his delightful "touch" it is which causes a joy in son and wife so deep as to produce swooning.¹ The touch is actually described as a "taste" and "having a sweet hand-taste," hattharasa, describes a woman pleasant to touch (cf. Jāt. 34 and 146, Introd.). Nor is this all. The "son-touch" gives the greatest joy as part of the process of sniffing at the child's head (Mbh. 1. 74, 120); but without sniffing the stroking of one who is loved is spoken of in the same way. Thus in the Introduction to one of the Buddhist Birth-stories (No. 158) two brothers are represented as expressing their joy at meeting again by "stroking each other's hands, feet, and backs." Or let us take another tale from the same collection of stories, which must reflect the normal expression of a real sentiment. In Jātaka, No. 281 (p. 395) a king wishes to express his love for his wife who is ill. He neither kisses nor embraces her, but "sits by her couch and strokes her back."

As early as the Rig Veda, "touch" thus expresses caress, not only in the "kindly touching (curative) hand" (10. 60. 12; cf. ib. 137. 7), but also in the verse (1. 62. 11): "The songs touch thee as loving wives touch a loving husband," a passage which illustrates as well the "caressing with song" already referred to. So "touch the heart" and "touch him near" are familiar Vedic expressions. They answer to the Latin use of

not always carried so. A little son is held in the lap by father or by mother; one "sets a dear son in one's bosom" (a suckling, of course, "to the breast"); but older children are carried either on the shoulder, or, commonly, on the hip, even when the bearer is a man. In Jāt. No. 74 (p. 328), "took their children in their arms" is an erroneous translation of what should have been rendered "by the hand," hatthesu gahetvā being like givāsu gahetvā "taking (each other) by the neck," in No. 146 (p. 497), the latter expressive of grief; cf. bālahasta, and, for references to the carrying of children, RV. 10. 69. 10; BAU. 6. 4. 24; VS. 29. 41; ŚB. 6. 8. 2. 3 and ib. 9. 2. 3. 50; also (in order) RV. 9. 101. 14; Jāt. No. 509 (p. 474); No. 196 (p. 127, last line); No. 250, and No. 538, p. 3.

¹ "Touch with affection till one swoons with joy," Āit. Brāh. 8. 20; cf. Sat. Brāh. 12. 5. 2. 8.

mulceo for blandior in Horace, Carm. 3, 11, 24, pueras Carmine mulces, and as mulceo "maltreat," stands to mulceo, so the same root in Sanskrit means "caress" and "injure," both being derived from the simple notion of touch, as applied for good or for evil. Only in the earliest literature the touch-caress or embrace is not an accompaniment of kissing, as it is later, both expressly and implicitly (as when, in the great epic, 3. 269. 22, it is brought into direct connection with the word "face": "Let no one touch your dear one's lovely face"); but it is associated with "heart" or with "body" only (*Rig Veda*, 8. 96. 11).

But it must not be supposed that kissing, although so well described in epic verse, is often mentioned there. On the contrary, although amorous scenes of quite unblushing naïveté are by no means infrequent, love-tokens are rarely of this sort. It is not at all probable that the later canons of dramatic propriety obtained for centuries before they were formulated, or that the epic poets anyway felt themselves restrained from indulging in descriptions of osculatory delights. The reason why kissing is so seldom mentioned in love passages is partly historical, partly racial. The historical difference may be expressed thus: a sniff-stage, or a sniff-and-lick-stage, preceded the stage of osculation. In the latter, the stage represented by the drama, and better still by the later *Gita Govinda* and other erotic poetry, sniffs are rare and kisses are common. But, at the same time, there was also a geographical distinction which is recognized by the Hindus themselves. For there came at last a time when kissing was reduced to a science and the sniff-kiss was no longer known, or known only to be sniffed at, so to speak. The author of this Hindu *ars amatoria* discusses the kiss in all its bearings and speaks of it as if it were the natural expression of amorous passion. Yet at the same time he recognizes that kissing is not everywhere the custom. "The women who live in the middle district," he says (meaning thereby the country east from what is now Delhi to Allahabad, and south from the Ganges to the Vindhya mountains), "chiefly Aryans, are refined and hate kissing . . . and so do the women of Balkh and of Avanti; whereas the women of Mālava and Abhīra love kisses." So says *Vātsyāyana*, the author of the native Science of Love; but another author, *Suvarṇanābha*, cited by *Vātsyā-*

yana, adds the caution that "individual character is more important than popular custom." Thus we are left to imagine that even some of the more refined Aryan ladies submitted to an occasional kiss.

Nevertheless, racial and geographical differences cannot wholly account for the historical facts presented by the literature in both positive and negative form. First comes the sniff-kiss, the only kind of kiss recognized till a late period, the end of the Vedic age. Then comes the real kiss, and as the latter grows popular the sniff-kiss declines until it finally almost disappears. But we may admit that, as among the Japanese, there were some who did not like to be kissed, and for this reason after kissing was known we occasionally find love passages without any description of kissing. For example, in the great epic, withal in a late section of the poem,¹ there is a very vivid and unabashed scene, where "amplexus atque osculans" would naturally have made part of the description. A distracted woman is here entreating a man to show her some token of affection. "I am very love-lorn for you," she cries, and "with love she hid him in her arms," exclaiming, as she embraces him, "embrace me also," but there is no hint of kissing, though "she had a pleasant hand" (touch) and the "pleasure of her hand" is especially mentioned. Yet this is long after kissing is customary. The explanation may be that given by Vātsyāyana, for the woman here is not only Aryan, she is of the highest Aryan caste.

¹ *Mahābhārata*, 18. 19. 79 ff.

The Origin and real Name of NIN-IB.—By ALBERT T. CLAY,
Assistant Professor in the University of Pennsylvania.


For years it has been recognized by most scholars that the name of the Babylonian deity which is written NIN-IB in Sumerian was pronounced differently by the Semites. Among the names proposed may be mentioned Adar, Nin-dar, Nin-rag, Nin-Urash and Nisroch. In *Business Documents of Murashū Sons* (BE. vol. x), I published the Aramaic equivalent for the Sumerian NIN-IB, which is אֲנוֹשָׁת. Before finding an additional tablet on which the Aramaic was found, there seemed to be some doubt whether the middle character should read נ or ש, but after finding another example, I argued, in the preface of my volume, for the reading נ, which, as will be seen below, must now be regarded as definitive. The Aramaic, however, instead of solving the problem, seemed to make the obscurity which hung over the pronunciation still more dense. As regards the vocalization of these characters, and the identification of the god with what is known, I offered no explanation in vol. x, nor in my *Light on the Old Testament from Babel*, p. 400.

Professor Hilprecht, in his editorial preface to my *Murashū*, vol. x, as well as in an article in the *Sunday School Times*, Sept. 25, 1904, took exception to my reading and read the characters אֲנָרְשָׁה, and proposed comparison with NIN-SHAH “lord of the boar”=the Syriac נְאַרְשָׁן=the Biblical Nisroch. The Syriac form, however, was misread by him and should be נְאַרְשִׁי (cf. Jastrow, *Rel. Bab. und Ass.* vol. i, p. 451), which of course makes the comparison impossible. Further, the final character of the Aramaic of NIN-IB is not ש but ת, as I had maintained. With this every other scholar who has commented upon the name (see below) has agreed. And, as I had stated, as will be seen below, also the middle character is not נ but ר.

Professor Zimmern, as reported by Professor Hilprecht in the *Sunday School Times* (Sept. 25, 1904), read: b l p r sh t = bel pirishti “Lord of decision.” Professor Prince in the *Journal of Biblical Literature* (Vol. 1905, p. 55), followed, in reading: Enu réshtu, “The chief lord.” Dr. Pinches, about

the same time, in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (Jan. 1905), read *En-resheth=Enu réshtu* "The primeval lord." Professor Johns, *Expository Times* (Dec. 1904), p. 141, read *Urashtu*, and on p. 141 *ibid.* *Arashtu*. Professor Sayee, in the same Journal (Dec. 1904), regarded it as equivalent to the Assyrian *In-arishti* "Lord of the mitre," the Sumerian for *Nin-Urush*. In the *Revue Sémitique* (1905, p. 93), Professor Halévy offered the reading, *En-napishti* "Lord of life," or preferably *En-nawashti=Eu-nammashhti* "seigneur de tout ce qui est doué de vie et de mouvement, de toute creature animée." Later (cf. *ibid.* p. 180), the same scholar offered two other explanations: *en-rishati* "seigneur de l'allégresse," and *en-arishti*, "seigneur du vêtement princier nommé *arishtu*." Professor Jensen (*Gilgamesh Epos*, p. 87) read and interpreted the character '*enwusht=namushtu=namurtu*', with which he compared the Biblical Nimrod. Besides Jensen and Halévy,¹ of those who have published their views, Lidzbarski is the only scholar who has accepted the reading 1 (cf. *Ephemeris*, vol. ii, p. 203).

In the forthcoming *William Rainey Harper Memorial Volumes* the writer will publish in full the Aramaic endorsements of the Murashū archives. For our present purpose the following reproductions of the Aramaic for NIN-IB, which appeared in *Murashū*, vol. x, p. xviii, will suffice.



¹ Three other explanations were sent me in private communications, *Irrishtu* the feminine of *Irrishu* "farmer," *en erishti* "lord of decision," and an identification with the Persian word for the planet Saturn, cf. *nivishti* *hudā* "the prescience of god" or *nuwashtan* "to go far away," due to the long course of Saturn. Inasmuch as I have not consulted the writers with reference to the publication of their views, I withhold their names.

The middle character is surely **ו** and not **ר**, as stated heretofore. The character in the first example is found in other Aramaic endorsements, Cf. also the different forms of **ו** in Lidzbarski, *Nordsem. Epig., Atlas*. In the second example, it can only be **ו**, as well as in the fourth. Conclusive proof that it is **ו** is to be found in the second example. We have only to refer to the **ר** in **כְּרָשָׁת**, and in **כְּרָ** in the next line of the endorsement, cf. *Murashû*, vol. x, p. 87, to see that it is not the character in question. The explanations of Jensen and Halévy are the only ones, therefore, that can be considered of those that have been published. The changes in Jensen's equation *emwusht* = *Nimrod*, while perhaps not without parallel, are rather too numerous, it seems to me, to inspire much confidence. *En-nam-mashti* "Lord of every living creature," the suggestion of Halévy, would be too difficult to explain in the light of the god's attributes with which we are familiar.

At the time of publishing the Aramaic equivalent found in the *Murashû* archives, about three years ago, I had in mind a number of theories, some of which have since been published by others, but which did not seem sufficiently satisfactory to warrant me in stating them. I am now prepared, however, to propose the reading *Eunashtu* for the characters **אנושת**, the Aramaic **ו**, as is known, representing *m* in Babylonian.¹

There seems to be no end to identifications of NIN-IB with other deities. Besides Nergal and Ningirsu of Telloh, there are *EN-TUR-DA* (perhaps *En-banda*), *APIN*, *MASH-MASH*, *Madanunu*, *Halhalla*, *Tishpu*, *Adaene*, *Shushinak*, *Dakbak*, etc. The last three are said to belong to Elam (cf. *II R.* 57: 47, 48, 49c). In view of this, the possibility that NIN-IB originally came from that region deserves consideration, particularly when it is borne in mind that the second element *Mashti* of *En-Mashti* could be associated with **וִשְׁתִּי** in the book of Esther, which in Babylonian would be written *Mashti*.² The fact that Esther was a Persian queen would

¹ Cf. *Amurru* written **אֲמֻרָּע**, or *Shamash* written **שָׁמַשׁ**, *Murashû*, vol. x, p. 8 and 9.

² Cf. Justi (*Handbuch der Zendsprache*, p. 272), who considers *Washti* an old Persian word *vahista* "best." Jensen (*Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, vi, p. 51; cf. also KAT², p. 485), calls attention to a deity *Mashti* (cf. *Layard*, p. 31:11, etc.).

make the identification of *Washti*¹ highly probable, but the identification of *En-mashtu* (NIN-IB) with *Masti*=*Washti* gives rise to difficulties, which become all the more striking when we take into consideration the meaning of the Sumerian *EN*, and the fact that *Masti* is the name of an Elamite goddess.

After careful consideration of all the conditions involved I beg to present a solution of the problem which I think will answer all the requirements, namely, the equation *En-Mashtu*=*En-Martu*=*Bēl-Amurru*. In other words, NIN-IB was called *EN-MAR-TU*², the god *par excellence* of the West land. For the change of *r* to *sh*, cf. *shipishti* for *shipirti* in the Murashû Documents; the Neo-Babylonian name *Mashtuku*, written *Martuku* in the Cassite period; also the deity *Ashka'iti*=*Arku'iti*, and the article by Jensen, ZA. vii, p. 179. For an exact parallel to *EN-MARTU*=*Bēl-Amurru*, cf. *EN-KAS*=*Bēl-Harrān*, in the name index of Johns, *Deeds and Documents*, and *Doomsday-Book*.

The god NIN-IB, as can be inferred from the Tel el-Amarna tablets, played an important rôle in Palestine in the latter half of the second millennium B.C. The name of the deity occurs in the Western Semitic proper name *Abdi-NIN-IB*. According to the collation of Knudtzon (cf. BA. iv, p. 114) there was also a city called *atū NIN-IB*. But more important than all else is the name of a place or temple in or near Jerusalem called *Bit-NIN-IB*. In view of this, the question, therefore, arises whether NIN-IB is not to be regarded as an Amorite deity?

¹ In this connection a personal name, *Ash-ta-Ma-ash-ti* (Johns, *Deeds and Documents*, 159:3), becomes especially interesting, the element *Ashta*, "friend," being Avestan for *Ās̄tar*, which is the name of a satrap of Peukelaotis (cf. Justi, *Iranisches Namebuch*, p. 47b). Cf. also the name *Ash-tu* in BE. vol. xv, 20, II, 10.

² The use of the Sumerian EN in the actual pronunciation of the name up to the latest times, is paralleled by the use of Ellil (cf. my "Ellil the god of Nippur," in the forthcoming number of AJSL) as the name of the foremost Nippurian deity. That *n* did not assimilate to the following *m* is to be explained, either in connection with the law of dissimilation by the substitution of *n* for a double consonant, cf. *issanundu*=*isanuddu*, or cf. *ittananmar*=*ittana'mar*, (Del., Ass. Gram.² p. 130), or *EN* was Babylonianized into *Enu*=*Enu-Mashtu*.

It seems reasonably certain that NIN-IB is not indigenous in Babylonia, an inference suggested already by the many gods regarded as equivalents. On the other hand, when the worship of the god was introduced into Babylonia, it would be natural to give a Babylonian designation; and since we have evidence for the existence of a god *IB*, it is plausible to assume that this deity had something to do with the appellation assigned to the foreign deity, namely NIN-IB. The element *NIN-IB* was at first associated with *IB*¹ as a kind of a consort.² In view of the peculiar conception prevailing in the early period of the Semites regarding the association of two gods, one as a superior and the other as a complement, we are not restricted in considering NIN-IB, even in this early age, necessarily as the wife, but in a general way we can regard the deity as the companion.³ Later, like Nin-Girsu of Telloh and others, the deity became masculinized.⁴ In this connection we are reminded of the group of gods in Harper's *Letters* (vol. iv, No. 358) where *NIN-IB* follows *NIN-IB* in the list of deities containing five gods with their female consorts. This, of course, may be an error on the part of the scribe (though a remarkable one), or it is due to the understanding that the god and his consort bore one and the same name. Cf. also *III R.* 69: 5a-b, where NIN-IB is said to be a god and a goddess. In connection with this it is interesting to note that among the terra-cotta images of deities found at Nippur, which hold in their hands the emblem of NIN-IB,⁵

¹ NIN-IB was long ago explained by Jeremias, "Lord of Ib," cf. Muss-Arnold, *Ass. Dic.*, p. 693.

² Later, however, in Dilbat, *MAMA* seems to be *IB*'s counterpart, cf. *Hammurabi Code III*, 22-29, and also *NIN-E-GAL*, cf. the Boundary Stone of Marduk-apal-iddin, *Del. en Perse*, vi, p. 37.

³ In the Cassite period there is a feminine name *Shar-hat-NIN-IB*, cf. BE. vol. xv, 185:9. If the first element is regarded a verbal form, then NIN-IB is very probably the subject.

⁴ On the transformation of the sex of deities, cf. Barton, *Semitic Origins*.

⁵ Professor Hilprecht regarded them as Bēl (i. e. Enlil) and Bēltis (Ninlil); cf. *Explorations in Bible Lands*, p. 528 and note 5. The symbol which seems to be that of NIN-IB, speaks against such an identification. Cf. Hinke, *A New Boundary Stone of Nebuchadrezzar*, Chap. I, and my remarks in the forthcoming number of *AJS*. on "Ellil the god of Nippur."

some wear beards and others do not. In later periods, NIN-IB as a rule was considered to be a masculine deity, and Gula, or Nin-Karrag, was his consort.

We find another Amorite deity in Babylonia who is called *MARTU-Amurru*,¹ bearing the same name as the land. There also continued to exist as late as the Achaemenian period a deity written *KUR-GAL-Amurru*² (cf. my BE. vol. x, p. 8, and vol. xiv, p. viii), who at one time had been regarded as an equivalent to Ellil. *MARTU* and *KUR-GAL* doubtless were one and the same god. It may be, therefore, that NIN-IB was originally the chief goddess of the Amorite land, and *MARTU* (or *IB* perhaps) the chief god, and that later, if the theory here proposed is correct, after *NIN-IB* had become masculinized in Babylonia, the deity was considered the god *par excellence* of the Amorite land, i. e., *Bél-Amurru*. When, therefore, the Babylonian language became the *lingua franca* in the second millennium B.C., the Western Semites, in writing the name of the chief deity, used the ideogram *NIN-IB*; for it is singularly striking that, while many names in the Babylonian contracts are compounded with *MAR-TU* (i. e. *Amurru*) in the Hammurabi and Cassite periods, and with *KUR-GAL* (also = *Amurru*) in the late period, and while in the Amarna letters, Dagon, Moleth, Addu, Ishtara (Ashirta), *NIN-IB*, and perhaps other deities of Palestine and Syria are represented, there should not be a single name compounded with *Amurru* in the Amarna tablets.³ All these considerations lead to the suggestion that perhaps NIN-IB represented in these letters *Amurru* the chief god of the Amorites, or rather the *Bél-Amurru*, who may have borne the same name as the land, like the god Ashur of Assyria, cf. *Bél-Harran*, *Bélit-Babili*, etc. That being true, the suggestion that *Bit-NIN-IB* was used in an appellative sense, and corresponded to the term *Béth-El*,

¹ For the reading *MAR-TU* = *Amurru*, cf. Meissner, *Seltene Assyrische Ideogramme*, No. 4187.

² The name *Buzur-Amurru* (*KUR-GAL*), not *Buzur-Bél*, the pilot of the ship in the Babylonian deluge story, considered in connection with the question of the possible Semitic origin of this part of the Gilgamesh epic (cf. my *Light on the Old Testament from Babel*, p. 75), becomes especially interesting.

³ Unless perhaps *Úru* = *Avurru* = *Amurru*, in the name *Uru-milki*.

"House of God,"¹ is especially striking. In this connection cf. the interesting title of an individual on his seal: *warad DIN-GIR-DINGIR-MAR-TU*, (Strassmaier, *Warka*, 45, 54, etc.) This, as Professor Jastrow has suggested, appears to be the *pluralis maiestatis*, which, in connection with *Amurru* (*MAR-TU*), may be intended to represent the chief deity of the Amorites,² and is to be compared with אֱלֹהִים as a generic designation for the god of the Hebrews.³

This suggests the inquiry, when was this god *En-Mashtu* (NIN-IB) introduced into Babylonia? At the time of the first dynasty of Babylon, the personal names show that the country was filled with foreigners, notably Arabians and Western Semites; cf. Ranke, *Personal Names*. The ruling dynasty at Babylon was surely Arabian,⁴ as is indicated by the names of the kings. In the Cassite period these foreign elements have practically disappeared (cf. my BE. vol. xiv, p. 3). In the Achaemenian period, as a result of the Babylonish captivity, the country is again filled with foreigners. The question also arises, do we have any light as to how the Western Semites came to live in Babylonia during the reign of the so-called Hammurabi dynasty? It is very probable that certain cities had been occupied by them for centuries, where they maintained their name and cult, adapted to their new surroundings. It is also not improbable that among the names occurring in the business documents, so many of which have an Arabian or Aramaic aspect, there are those who were transported as captives to Babylonia, or their descendants, as in Assyrian times.⁵ Taking into consideration the fact that in the Cassite period the West Semitic element is no longer seen in the proper names, we are led to the conclusion that either "waves of immigration" continued during the two

¹ Cf. KAT.², p. 411; also Haupt, *Independent*, Jan. 12, 1890.

² Cf. the conclusions at which Professor Barton arrived with reference to *AN-MESH* in the Amarna letters, namely, that it is equivalent to בָּבֶל אֱלֹהִים (cf. Proc. AOS., 1892, p. cxcvii).

³ Muss-Arnold (*Ass. Dic.*, p. 695) says "the Assyrian scribe substituted the name of the Assyrian deity Ninib for the Canaanitish Jahweh."

⁴ Cf. also Weber's recent article in OLZ. on *Der Name Hammurabi in einer südarabischen Inschrift*, 1907, p. 146.

⁵ That this custom was practiced in the third millennium B.C. can be inferred from the fact that the Elamite Chedorlaomer, in Genesis 14:16, not only carried away Lot, but women and people as well.

millenniums prior to the time of the first dynasty; or that the people of the West at certain times were able to conquer Babylonia; or that there were centers, which for centuries the Semites held, and where they developed what we recognize as Semitic Babylonian. Reaching backward into antiquity, we have here and there sporadic survivals of Semitic domination, but our horizon is yet too short to ascertain how the Semitic elements came to be introduced into Babylonia. Akkad seems to have been one of those early centers, as is indicated by the inscriptions and the names of the rulers; for example, Shargâni-shar-âli and Narâm-Sin. Cf. especially the name Lipush-Iaum,¹ the granddaughter of Narâm-Sin. In this connection we recall the fact that the ideogram usually meaning "Akkad" has also the meaning *Urtu* and *Amurrâ* (cf. Weissbach, *Miscellen*, p. 29). In other words, the Semites who settled in Babylonia are known as the people of the country "Akkad," the cuneiform ideogram for which land has also the meaning "Armenia" and "Ammorite land," although these countries also had their own names in Sumerian, namely *Tilla* and *Ari*. And this fact, as has been held by others, points to those regions as the origin of the Semites.

The names of the kings of the Isin dynasty² seem to show Western Semitic influence and the capital was doubtless a stronghold of this people. In the first name, *Ish-bi-Ur-ra*, *Ishbi* is probably a West Semitic element; cf. *Ja-ash-bi-i-la*, Ranke, *Personal Names*, p. 114. *Ishbi* could be a Babylonian-

¹ In my *Light on the Old Testament from Babel*, p. 288, I should have mentioned also this name as occurring before the time of Moses. *Iau* here is the exact form in which the divine name Jahweh appears in the Assyrian inscriptions when it is compounded with other elements: cf. *ibid.*, pp. 288 and 241. Until, therefore, we have reasons for explaining the name differently, we must assume that the divine name was known in this early age.

² Cf. the list published by Hilprecht, BE. vol. xx, pl. 1. The facts gained from this chronological fragment are especially interesting and important, because it is known that the Isin dynasty was overthrown by Rim-Sin, the Elamite ruler of Southern Babylonia, which took place in the 17th year of Sin-muballit, the father of Hammurabi. If this event marks the close of the Isin dynasty, it becomes a simple matter to restore the chronology backwards as far as covered by the list. Reckoning the first year of Hammurabi at 2100 B.C., the beginning of Ur-NIN-IB's reign would be about 2328 B.C., and Ur-Engur's about 2445 B.C.

ized form of this foreign element. The next name *Gimil-ilishu* is Babylonian. *Idin-Dagan* contains the name of the Palestinian god Dagon, which is found a little earlier in the date of the 37th year of Dungi, where a temple dedicated to Dagon is mentioned. *Ishme-Dagan*, his son, follows. It is, of course, not impossible that *Idin* and *Ishme* are Babylonianized forms of **לִנְיָה** and **וַיְמָשָׁה**, well known as elements in West Semitic names. *Ur-NIN-IB* follows the Babylonian name *Lilit-Ishtar*, both of which, however, contain the names of Western Semitic deities. The first occurrence of the god NIN-IB that I have been able to find is little earlier. It is in the title of the first year of Dungi: *MU USII E NIN-IB KI-BA-A-GAR*. "The year the foundation of the temple NIN-IB was laid" (cf. Thureau-Dangin, *Inscr. de Sumer et d'Akkad*, p. 330). From this it would be reasonable to conjecture that the deity was well known in Babylonia even centuries before this time. *Ur* of *Ur-NIN-IB*, which in Babylonian means *amēl*, may also be West Semitic, cf. *Uru-milki* or *Milki-uru*. After *Bur-Sin*, his son, there follow a number of names more or less uncertain as to their reading, most of which appear to be foreign. Inasmuch as the names of their ancestors are not given, it has been properly assumed that most of them were usurpers.

Beneath the pavement laid by *Ur-NIN-IB* in the Temple Court of Nippur, Doctor Haynes found hundreds of fragments of votive vases, statues, etc., which had been dedicated to Ellil, centuries earlier. This clearly points to a disaster which befell the temple, and, doubtless, the city. Professor Hilprecht in BE. vol. i, pt. 2, attributed this to Kudur-Nankundi (c. 2285 B.C.). In *Explorations in Bible Lands*, p. 380, he considered that it was done by the Elamites on a "first Elamitic invasion which occurred about two hundred years before the second one." This is his present view,¹ with the exception that he makes the first invasion 125 years earlier than the second. He also raises the question "whether these two invasions are only two known phases of that great political movement and migration of natives, etc." He considers also that it was at this time that the buildings in the mounds south of the temple were destroyed, where on the last campaign Doctor Haynes had found thousands of clay tablets, mostly fragmentary. As far as I can

¹ Cf. BE. vol. xx, pt. i, p. 54.

ascertain, there is no evidence to show that the ancient enemy of Babylonia, the Elamites, invaded the land in the third millennium B.C., prior to Kndur-Nankundi. Neither is there evidence that the tablets of the temple school in the mound south of the temple were destroyed prior to *Ur-NIN-IB*. The circumstance that the vase and statue fragments were found beneath *Ur-NIN-IB's* pavement in the temple area, would imply that the disaster took place prior to or in *Ur-NIN-IB's* reign. If it should prove to have occurred immediately before, I would suggest the probability of an Amorite invasion at this time, perhaps headed by *Ur-NIN-IB*, though it is equally probable that it could have taken place some time earlier than *Ur-NIN-IB*, and we should thus be led back to the beginning of this Semitic dynasty. However this may be, Isin is one of the early Semitic centers; and it becomes, therefore, highly probable that during the reign of this dynasty, the Western Semitic elements, occurring in the nomenclature of the tablets of the first dynasty of Babylon, were brought into Babylonia.

[Since reading this paper at the meeting of the American Oriental Society in Philadelphia, April 5th of this year, the interesting articles of Dr. Ranke and Professor Meissner in *OLZ.*, March, 1907, have reached me. Ranke calls attention to a date on a tablet, which is written in Semitic. It reads *shattum sha Li-bi-it-Ishtar A-mu-ru-um it-ru-du-ush*, "In the year in which *Amurum* drove away *Lubit-Ishtar*." His suggestion that this probably refers to the Amorites, who at the time invaded Babylonia, agrees with the theory set forth above, and may be said to furnish a confirmation of it. Ranke's rendering of the date, with its important reference to an interference on the part of the Amorites in the affairs of Babylonia, deserves the preference over that of Meissner, who would render the passage as referring probably to *Amurum*, a city near Sippara. The fact that *Lubit-Istar*, neither in this nor in another passage, has the title "king," is not a sufficient reason for questioning the identification. We would hardly expect to find a date recording the fact that an appointed governor, or any one else but a king, was driven out. If, therefore, *Lubit-Ishtar* is the name of a king, *Amurum* can only refer to the people, and we have a specified time when the Amorites entered Babylonia.]

An early Babylonian Tablet of Warnings for the King.—By
STEPHEN LANGDON, Ph.D.

THIS tablet, numbered D.T. 1, was published first in IV Raw. 48, republished in the second edition by Mr. Pinches, and again in CT. 15, pl. 50, by Mr. L. W. King. It has been edited by Alfred Boissier, *Recherches sur quelques contrats Babyloniens*, pp. 7–20, and previously translated by Prof. Sayce in *Records of the Past*, vii. 119. By means of the new editions we are now able to re-edit the tablet and to get from it several new philological forms, as well as some interesting information about the early Babylonian state. The tablet itself is a copy made for Ašurbanapal.

For Sumerian philology the tablet yields the following new material. It gives the reading *hap* for *bu'šānnu* “shame”, Br. 10174 (line 6). For ◇◇ the context and euphonic ending *ni* in line 6 render a Semitic *šanū* certain. The ideogram *Šu-Ud-Sag* occurs in obv. 14, rev. 4, 14. From the gloss *manzaz pan šarri*, as well as from the context of the three passages, we know that this Sumerian ideogram meant “general of the army.” The Semitic reading is *šatamu rēštū*. The context of line 21 obv. makes the meaning “hunger” certain for Br. 9738. Obverse 36 gives a reading in *r* for *bi* = *tēbū*.

For Semitic philology we gain considerable new material. Obverse 3 and 8 give the imperfect piel of בְּשָׁנָה. Obverse 8 *tādātu* “knowledge.” Obverse 1. 22, an imp. piel *uṣub* for *utib*; 1. 34 gives a kal imp. of *rašādu*, *iršid*, a stative verb; 1. 36 gives also the original sense of *tēbū* as “lead.” On the phrase *šamša šakānu* = “place before the sun,” see Rev. 3 and note. Rev. 9 gives a new word *armu* = “earnings.”

The contents of the tablet may be divided as follows:

- a) Obv. 1–8, general moral obligations.
- b) 9–10, warning against injustice towards the Sipparians.
- c) 11–14, warning against injustice towards the Nippurians.
- d) 15–18, warning against injustice towards the Babylonians.

- e) 19-30, against putting any one of these people into prison, putting the *dupšikku* upon them.
- f) 31-34, against taking the fodder of these three peoples for his horses.
- g) 35-Rev. 13, against levying any of these people for his army.
- h) 14-18, against causing any of the officials to serve the temple overseer as slaves of the gods.

The order of the three privileged cities, Sippar, Nippur and Babylon, does not necessarily indicate the capital as at Sippar, and hence the time as before Hammurabi; for when Nabopolassar built the temple of Ninib he summoned the inhabitants of Nippur, Sippar and Babylon. In each case Babylon is mentioned last, and in Nabopolassar's time Babylon was the capital. When Nebuchadnezzar built the stage tower of Babylon, he summoned people from the upper to the lower sea.¹ According to this tablet, the above proceeding of Nabopolassar in making the Nippurians, Sipparians and Babylonians work with *dupšikkus* (baskets carried on the head) was not legal. We can imagine that the inhabitants of these ancient cities either had lost their special rights, or else that the necessity of the times, when Babylonia had just wrested her independence from Assyria, made it necessary for all citizens to work.

To bear the *dupšikku* was a sign of forced labor. When the king Nabopolassar himself put on the *dupšikku* and worked on the temple, he meant it only as a pious act, probably to encourage his workmen.² This tablet makes it clear that the king had no right to force any citizen of these sacred cities to bear the *dupšikku*.

What will astonish the student of history more than any other of the warnings is the one against levying soldiers from these three cities. That could have been possible only when Babylonia was an immense empire and had foreign soldiers to draw upon. The only period possible is that of Hammurabi. This is another proof that the sources of the great Ašurbanapal library were Old Babylonian.

¹ See Nab. 4, 25 and Neb. 17. 2, 34-3, 24 in the writer's *Building Inscriptions of the Neo-Babylonian Empire*.

² Nab. 1, 2, 56.

THE TEXT.

- Obv. 1. šarru a-na di-ni la i-kál nišé-šu inniši-a¹ mat-su
in-nam-mi.
 2. a-na di-in māti-su la i-kál ⁱⁱE-a šar Šimáti
 3. Šim-ta-šu u-ša-an-ni-ma a-ḥi-ta uš-šib-šu
 4. a-na abkalli-šu la i-kál umé-su ikarrā²
 5. a-na um-me-a la i-kál mat-su ibbakin-su
 6. a-na giš-hap-pi³ i-kál tēmat⁴ išanū⁵
 7. a-na Igi-ut ⁱⁱE-a i-kál ilani rabiti
 8. ina štud-ti u tu-da-at⁶ mi-ša-ri uš-šib-šu
 9. mār Sippari i-da-as-ma a-ḥa-am i-din ⁱⁱŠamatš
dajan̄ šamē u irsitim
 10. di-na a-ḥa-am ina māti-šu išakkan⁷-ma abkallu u
dajan̄ ana di-nim la ibašši

¹ Ideogram

value of Br. 11209 is unknown. The root for ešū=“be in confusion,” is here construed with the verb *me*=“to be” to form the passive. On this construction for the passive the writer has given an exposition in *Syntax du Verbe Sumerien*.

² Id. *gud-da* Br. 10192. For *karū*, “be short”; cf. Peiser, *Bab. Rechtsleben* 4, p. 59; AJSL. xxvii, 99, note 2. In *mikku kuri* = the gum is dried up, *Leipziger sem. Studien* II, p. 80, an expression for “fasting.” The Sumerian word for “long” is *gid*; the same root *gud* = *zakru* [Br. 4708] and *ēlū* [4704], word for “high.” *gud* is also the well-known word for “steer.” The fundamental meaning of *kurū* is probably “cut off,” for which the Sum. root is rather *bar*. It seems at present impossible to explain this contradiction. Br. 10162 is a loan-word from the Semitic.

³ Id , *giš-hap-pi*, a loan word, already gone over into Semitic before S^b (383), i. e. before Hammurabi.

⁴ Id. , with phonetic ending *mat*. This gives a new word for the lexicon, *tēmtu* fem. abstract of *tēmu*. [Suggested to me by Charles Virolleaud.]

⁵ Id. -ni, beyond doubt=šanū “be changed,” to be added to Br. 9960.

⁶ *Tūdātu*, to be added to Del., HW. 306.

⁷ For double acc. of *šakānu* s. HW. 657 b, and for original sense “lay upon,” KB. VI. 1, 383.

11. *mārē Nippur ana di-nim ub-lu-ni-šum-ma kāt kat-ra-a-ti-ma¹ i-da-aş-su-nu-ti
12. ⁱⁱ"Bēl bēl mātāti amēlu nakra a-ḥa-am
13. i-da-kaš šum-ma şâbē-šu u-šam-ga-tim
14. rūbū u šu-tam² rēštū-šu ina sūki zi-lul-liš³ iş-sa-nun-du
15. kaspu mār Babili ilki-e-ma ana makkuri u-še-ri-bu
16. di-in amēlāti Babili işme-ma ana ka-li isha-ru
17. ⁱⁱ"Marduk bēl šamē u irşitim ai-bi-šu eli-šu işak-kān-ma
18. buşî-šu makkuri-šu a-na amel nakri-šu i-şar-rak
19. mār Nippur Sippar Babili an-na e-ne-da
20. a-na bit si-bit-tim šu-ru-bu
21. a-şar an-nam in-ni-en-du alu ana birāti⁴ işşappak.
22. a-na bit si-bit-tim šu-ru-bu amēlu aja u-ṭu-ub
23. Sippar Nippur u Babili mithariş nam-bi
24. şabē šu-nu-tim dup-şı-ik-ka e-me-da-am
25. il-ki şı-si-it amēlu na-gi-ri e-li-şu-nu u-kan-nu
26. ⁱⁱ"Marduk abkal ilāni rubū muş-ta-lim
27. mat-su a-na a-mēl nakri-šu u-sah-ħar-ma
28. umma-ni māti-šu dup-şı-ik-ka ana amēlu nakri-šu i-za-bil
29. şabē šu-nu-tim ⁱⁱ"A-nim ⁱⁱ"Bēl u ⁱⁱ"E-a ilāni rabāti
30. a-şı-bi šamē u irşitim ina pu-uħ-ri-şu-nu šu-ba-ra-şu-nu u-kin-nu
31. mār Sippar Nippur u Babili
32. im-ra-şu-nu a-na mur-ni-is-ki işruki
33. mur-ni-is-ki šu-ut im-ra-şu-nu i-ku-lu
34. i-na şı-bit-ti ai-bi ir-ħid-du-u.⁵

¹ HW. 600 b *katrū* is from root כְּתַר “call together” [Jensen], seen in the old Bab. phrase for dying *ištu ilu-şa ikteru-şı*, “when her god calls her,” CT. VIII. 4 a, 11, etc.

² Delitzsch under *zilulliš*, HW., p. 256, cites this passage and translates the ideogram by “Obersten.” This citation is to be added to Br. 7217, *Şatam*, an official whose exact position is not clear. In CT. XXII, No. 1, 32, the king writes to the ș. for information about tablets. According to BA. III, 389, “singer.” Cf. also *şatamüti*=office of a ș. CT. II. 43, 10.

³ *Zilulliš*, from לִלְעָל to roll, root to be added to the lexicon.

⁴ Id. *Ki-Kak*, Br. 9788=hunger.

⁵ *Rašādu*, “zu etwas gelangen,” Arabic شَدَّ, “to lead in a straight path, arrive at a place without fail.” The shafel, *ušarħid* “to place,” is from the same root. Boissier *ir-rid-du-u*.

35. *sabē šu-nu-tu i-na di-ku-ti um-man-māti*¹
šarru-di-ku-u
36. *ilu Gir-ra tēbū² pa-an umma-ni-šu*
37. *pa-an ummani-šu imahha-aṣ-ma it-[ti amēl] nakri-*
šu ittalla-ak
38. *si-in-du-at alpē-šu . . . u-paṭ-ṭar-šam-ma*
39. *iklē- [šu . . .] u-ša-an-nu-u*
40. *a-na a-hi a-ni-hi ra? . . . im i-har-ru-ub*
41. *si-bit-ti sēnē . . . i-sab-ba-tu³*
- Rev. 1. *"Adad ašarid šamē u irsitim*
2. *nam-maš-še-e sēri- šu ina lu-šah-ḥi u-šam-kat-ma*
3. *nikē Šumē šamša ušaškin⁴*
4. *um-ma-an u ša-tam rēštū⁵ man-za-az pa-an šarri*
5. *a-mat-sun u-lam-man da-aṣ-sun i-mah-ḥar*
6. *ina ki-bit ilu E-a šar abzu*
7. *um-ma-an u ša-tam rēštū ina? inuhbū⁶*
8. *ša-ar-šu-nu a-na na-me-e ik-ka-am-mar*
9. *ar-ma-kat-sun ša-a-ru i-tab-bal ip-ṣit-sun za-ki-ki-iš*
im-man-ni
10. *rik-si-šu-un u-paṭ-ṭar-šam-ma abnu na-ru-a-šu-nu*
u-ša-an-nu-u
11. *a-na ḥarrani u-še-iṣ-ṣu-šu-nu-tim a-na a-di-e i-*
šu-nu-ti

¹ CT. 15 gives *?* nu-meš; IV R. 48 gives illegible signs from māt to šarru.

² Id. -ra. cf. Br. 5120. This reading is probable in Sumerian for

tēbū 5128. The fundamental meaning of طحنا etc., is "drive out, lead away." Cf. *Wadi Brissa* 3. 52, *ištū Barsip-ki it-ti-ḥa-am-ma*, "he marched forth from Borsippa." The ideogram KAS as sgn. of alāku is assured by the two passages Gudea Cyl. A 1, 15, *du-sa im-ma-KAS* and 17, 29, *du-zu ba-gin*.

³ Cf. Nebuchad. *Freibrief* 1, 55.

⁴ This transcription is given with hesitation. If the interpretation be correct, the phrase šamša šakānu = "place before the sunlight" (i.e., cause to be strewn upon the ground, so that the sun may bleach) may be added to the lexicon. Boissier, *u-ša-ša-ša* from *lušašu* (?) cf. HW. 151 b.

⁵ Cf. obv. 14.

⁶ Id. -bi. Br. 10540 is probably to be read *tub*. The sign

in classical Sumerian had two meanings: *dur+durun = ašābu* "to dwell" (intransitive); and "inhabit, install" (transitive), which had a reading ending in -b. This I take to have been *tub*, *tib*. The meaning here is passive of *nāhu* in the piel, which meaning can be rendered only by the *kal*.

12. *il^u Nabu dup-šar Esagila šušgal kiššat šamē u irši-timm u-ma' [ir] gim-ri*
 13. *mu-ad-du-u šarru-tu šim-mat māti-šu u-pat-ṭar-ma a? ?-u*
 14. *lu amēlu ša-tam ekur lu ša-tam rēštu šarri*
 15. *ša ina Sippar Nippur u Babili ana amēli ša-tam ekur ušazzi-zu*
 16. *dup-šik-ku bitāti ilāni rābūti im-me-du-šu-nu-tim*
 17. *ilāni rābūti i-gu-gu-ma i-ni-is-su-u ud-ma-an-šu-un*
 18. *lu ir-ru-bu a-na ki-iṣ-ṣi- šu-un.*

šarru a-na di-nim la i-kūl gamru

*ekal Ašurbanapal šar kiššati šar mat Aššur
 ša ^{il^u} Nabu u ^{il^u} Tašmetum uzna rapšatum išrukus
 iħuzzu ēnē namirtum nišik dupšarruti
 šá ina šarrāni alik maħri-ja mimma šipru šuatum la
 iħuzzu
 nimēki Nabu ti-kip sa-an-tak-ki mala bašmu
 ina duppē aštur asnik abrema
 ana tamarti si-ta-as-si-ja kirib ekali-ja ukin.*

TRANSLATION.

- Obv. 1. If the king do not give heed to justice, his people will come into anarchy and his land will go to ruin.
 2. If he do not give heed to justice in his land, Ea, the lord of fates,
 3. will alter his fate and bring about another (fate) for him.
 4. If he do not give heed to his *abkallu*,¹ his days will be cut off.

¹The prepositional object of a verb may be either direct object or an ethical dative as here. For the same verb *uššib* with *šu* as direct object see line 8, and for a verb with both objects cf. *uštabil-ak-šu*, CT. VI. p. 19. b 15. (Translated in *Babylonia and Palestine*, page 169.)

²*Abkallu*, literally "the great teacher," means "adviser," etc. In Gudea Cyl. A 22, 17 he is called "the *abkallu* of mysteries." Other references in the writer's appendix to Thureau-Dangin's *Sumer-Akkad-Königsinschriften*.

5. If he do not give heed to the priestess,¹ his land will rebel against him.
6. If he give heed to the slanderer, (his) decisions will be changed.
7. If he give heed to the counsel² of Ea, the great gods
8. will cause him to dwell in wisdom and knowledge of righteousness.
9. If he oppress the inhabitants of Sippar and render justice to a stranger, then will Shamash, judge of heaven and earth,
10. render judgment to the stranger in his land, and he shall have neither councilor nor judge for judgment.
11. If the Nippurians bring aught to him for judgment and he oppress them by reason of gifts
12. then will Bēl, lord of the lands, summon the hostile stranger
13. against him and will cause him to slaughter his soldiers;
14. the prince³ and his chief šatamu shall be dragged about the streets.
15. If he seize the money of the Babylonians and bring it into his treasury,
16. If he hear the plea of the Babylonians but be too negligent to give heed,
17. then shall Marduk, lord of heaven and earth, place his enemy over him
18. and bestow his property upon his foe.
19. If he charge with crime any Nippurian, Sipparian or Babylonian
20. and cause him to be put into prison,
21. the city where the criminal charge is brought shall be turned into a desolate place.
22. If he cause (one of these) to be brought into prison and does good unto a stranger,

¹ For *ummu* in the sense of "priestess," see Behrens, *Leipziger semitische Studien* II. 2, p. 9.

² Bossier reads *ši-pir*.

³ *Rubū* here has the meaning crown prince = *mār šarri rabū*, cf. *Leip. Sem. St.* II., p. 41.

23. if he assemble the Sipparians, Nippurians and Babylonians,
 24. and put the *dupsikku* (sign of slavery) upon these peoples and
 25. establish over them the *ilku*-service or military service (?)
 26. then will Marduk, *abkallu* of the gods, the prince who gives counsel,
 27. turn his land over to his foe,
 28. and the people of his land will carry the *dupsikku* for his foe,
 29. for that people will Anu, Bel and Ea, the great gods
 30. that dwell in heaven and earth, in their conclave decree their dispersion.
 31. As to the inhabitants of Sippar, Nippur and Babylon,
 32. if he give their fodder unto horses,
 33. the horses that eat their fodder
 34. shall go into the possession of (his) foe.
 35. If when he summons the militia of his land
 he summon this people,
 36. the pest god, who leads his army,
 37. will smite his army and accompany his foe;
 38. the yoke of his oxen he will loose,
 39. and his fields he will devastate.¹
 40. If to a stranger he . . . but make a desert of
 41. and take tribute of cattle
- Rev. 1. then Adad, regent of heaven and earth,
 2. will slay the flocks of his farms with hunger,
 3. and the lamb offerings of Šamaš will he cause the sun to see;
 4. as to the army and the chief *šatamu*, private official of the king,
 5. their affairs will he render evil and bring about their affliction.
 6. By the command of Ea, lord of the nether sea,
 7. the army and the private official will be undone in ? ;
 8. their place will be shattered to ruins;

¹ Probably nothing wanting in the break.

9. the work¹ of their hands the wind shall wither away,
their industry shall be counted as a breath of
air;
10. all of them will he undo,² their memorial inscriptions
will he change.
11. If he cause them to go forth on an expedition, if con-
trary to the laws³ he ? them.
12. Nabu, scribe of Esagila, the *šušgal*⁴ of heaven and
earth who regulates all things,
13. the establisher of royalty, will do away with the
destiny of his land and ?
14. Be it a shepherd,⁵ be it a *šatamu*, be it the king's
chief *šatamu*,
15. who are in Sippar, Nippur or Babylon; if he cause
these to come before the *šatam* of the temple,
16. if he put upon them the *dupšikku* of the temples of
the great gods,
17. the great gods will be angry and leave their habita-
tions,
18. and enter no more into their dwellings.

"If the king do not give heed to justice" is finished.

Palace of Ašurbanapal, king of the universe, king of
Assyria,
to whom *Nebo* and *Tašmētu* have given under-
standing;
who has received clear eye-sight, a training in the
belles lettres;
Since among the kings, my predecessors, none had
received this commission;

¹ *armu* from the root מְרַע “to heap up.”

² The phrase *riksa pataru* in religious texts means “remove the utensils of the ritual service,” Zimmern Rt. p. 94, *riksi-šun*=all of them. Jensen KB. VI. 1, 347. The phrase may have reference here to the ritual service; in that case the connection is obscure.

³ On *adū* = law from מְרַע = Heb. מְרַע see also Behrens, *Leip. Sem. St.* II. 1, p. 35.

⁴ On *sa-gar* cf. ZA. 9, 222, and Appendix to Th.-Dangin, aaO., p. 270.

⁵ Here probably an official.

the wisdom of Nebo, the *tikip santakku* (?) as much
as there is,
have I written upon tablets and compiled and redacted,
and for the public gaze and my own reading have I
put them in my palace.

Additional lexicographical note on "ilkū," ob. 25.

According to this line the king had no right to put the *ilkū* and *šisit nāgiri* upon the inhabitants of Sippur, Nippur and Babylon. In the *Freibrief* of Nēbuchadnezzar I [cf. KB. III, p. 166], a deserving general petitions the king that certain towns in the land of *Namar* be freed from the *ilkū* of *Namar*. This freedom consisted in the regulation that the *kalū* of the king, the *šakin* of *Namar* and the *nagir* should not enter these towns; other regulations about taxes in cattle and horses follow, and that soldiers from Nippur and Babylon must not imprison any one in these towns. Evidently the *ilkū* was a state tax due the central government from which Sippur, Babylon and Nippur had been freed at a very early period. The phrase *ilkam alāku* [cf. Meissner, *Suppl.*] occurs frequently in the Code of Hammurabi in the sense of "render public obligations upon land," cf. Daiches in ZA. 18, 214-216. A house or garden *ina pan ilki*=under obligation of the *ilkū* tax, Code 10, 54. In the Code land is often spoken of as being given to an *uku-uš* officier or soldier under condition that he pay the *ilkū*; in 31, 91 a priestess must pay the *ilkū*. Whether *ilkū* be the Semitic translation for the well-known *giš-bar* tax cannot be answered with certainty. For other references or discussions of *ilkū* cf. Ham. Let. 26. 10. 16; BA. IV. 456; ZA. 18, 206; Ham. Code par. 40; Johns, ADD. II, 174. *Šisit am nāgiri* summons to military service, so Johns in translation of Code 8, 44 and *Babylonian and Assyrian Laws*, etc., p. 202. According to the code a male or female slave who has run away from the palace or from a *muškēnu* (poor man) must not be retained so as to fail in doing the *šisit nāgiri* service. If a female slave were required to do this service the same could hardly have been military. The *nāgiru* of Babylon is mentioned among three *elders* (*šebu*) before whom a process was brought, CT. VIII, 40 A 2.

Road Notes from Cilicia and North Syria.—By Mr. J. RENWICK METHENY, the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

RETURNING to Asia Minor in January 1905, after an absence of several years,¹ I spent twenty-two months in travel through little known parts of Cilicia and North Syria, taking note of antiquities and making some copies of inscriptions. Of ten months in Cilicia, two were spent in Guzney. In North Syria over six months were given to Marash and the country around it, to Aintab and its vicinity a month, and to Alexandretta a month. The greater part of July 1906 was given to a ride through Mesopotamia. From the above-named places as centers, short trips were made in many directions, and several new routes were traversed. Through the kindness of the missionaries, and other friends in the above-named places, I was enabled to do much that otherwise could not have been done, and I acknowledge my indebtedness with thanks.

Mersina, the principal seaport of southeast Asia Minor, is built on the site of an older town. Hakmoun (Soli) is two hours west of Mersina, and Karadawar is an hour east of it. From Karadawar to Hakmoun, at frequent intervals along the seashore, are extensive ruins which are partly buried in sand, and do not seem to have attracted much notice.

Until maps can be made from actual surveys, those of Dr. Kiepert will remain the standard for travelers. In many instances we find places not mapped, and others so misnamed, or misplaced, or both, that the traveler has nothing on which to rely. Whole districts remain unvisited and uncharted up to the present time. In slightly traveled parts of the country the natives are suspicious of foreigners, and consequently give information which often proves false or misleading. Several names of places in the country north of Mersina are incorrectly given by Dr. Kiepert. I give the right names and then (in

[¹ The writer was born in Syria, where his parents and grandparents were missionaries. He has lived more than sixteen years in Cilicia, spending his winters in Mersina and his summers in Guzney.—ED.]

(parenthesis) the wrong names, as follows:—Kristian Koi (Giaour Koi), Yeni Koi (Mantash), Bulukli (Balukli), Arabler (Arabli), Ichme (Ishme). When it is considered that “Ishme” means “Work not,” and “Ichme” means “Drink not,” the thing becomes clear. The springs at Ichme are both hot and sulphurous, hence the correct name Ichme. The map submitted with this article was made by the writer, who claims for it only that it is less incorrect than any other map of this region.

Though the history of Namrun previous to the 11th century A. D. is obscure, there is no reason for doubting its antiquity. North of Namrun, near the Inje Boyunu, some extensive ruins are reported.

On the road from Mersina to Guzney are the following antiquities: North of Kristian Koi, to the left of the road, is a cemetery. Northwest of Arabler, in the valley below the road, is a chapel and monastery, and north of it are two rock-cut tombs in the side of a ridge. A fortified cave may be seen in the west side of the Mersina River gorge. Half way between Arabler and Doluk Dar is an ancient wall by the road-side, and near it Dr. von Luschan mentions part of a Hittite inscription. An hour from Arabler, on the upper road to Doluk Dar, are some very old ruins, found by my father over twenty years ago. Half way between Doluk Dar and Guzney are a Roman cemetery and pavement. On the Eachma road from Mersina to Guzney is a Roman bath at the Ichme hot springs.

Lower Guzney is half way up the valley on the west side. Precipitous mountains form the west and east walls to the valley, and from their bases the ground slopes to a little stream which falls over a precipice into the Karenlik valley. Guzney castle stands on a bold promontory on the east side of the valley. In 1895 I first heard of an inscription said to be below the castle. It was finally located for me by a mountaineer in April, 1905, being found on a rock near the west side of the Sheik Bagh road. In the east face of this rock is a panel which contains an Aramaic inscription of five lines, the initial letter being about two inches in height. The first copy which I made was sent to Prof. Lamberton of the University of Pennsylvania, but unfortunately it was not satisfactory. In the

spring of 1906 Dr. Badeer, of Mersina, helped me to take a wax impression of the inscription, from which I made better copies. Prof. J. A. Montgomery has been occupied in making a translation of this inscription from copy given him by Dr. M. Jastrow, Jr., of the University of Pennsylvania.

The shortest natural route to the Bulgar dagh region passes through the Guzney valley. This region would seem to merit a thorough search for antiquities, as it is little known outside of the main routes of travel.

Zenjirli (Shamal) is five days east of Mersina. In the Amanus mountains, westward, is a place called Yarpuz. Two hours east of Zenjirli are the village and mound of Albustan. Four days north of Albustan and Yarpuz are two places bearing the same names, and relatively the same positions. It is not improbable that the people of Shamal originally came from the vicinity of the two northern places, one of which was undoubtedly Hittite. About three hours south of Zenjirli is a lake heretofore not mapped. It is in the foothills of the Amanus, and can be seen only from the mountains above it.

In company with the late Mr. C. S. Sanders, of Aintab, I visited several places of interest in North Syria and Mesopotamia. Two hours north of Aintab is the village of Doluk-baba (Doliche), and near it is a large mound, the probable site of the old town. West of this village is a low hill in which are many rock-cut tombs, the majority of which seem to be Greek and Roman. The largest cave in the cemetery evidently was the crypt of a Syriac church. The tombs are commonly decorated with sculptured ornaments, and in a few of them are rude bas-reliefs of the former occupants. The doorway in most of the tombs was closed by a stone disc, which had a slot cut for it in one side of the entrance. Near the village mosque lies a Corinthian capital, and other fragments are scattered over the ground, in the vicinity of Doluk-baba.

Eight hours south of Aintab is Killis. The horse road to it runs near a Roman road, which can be traced part way from Alexandretta to a point three hours west of Elif.

The road from Killis to Huro-Peghamber (Cyrrhus)¹ crosses the Afrin river by a Roman bridge of one arch, and the Sabun

¹ Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Geog.*, p. 787.

river by a splendid bridge of six arches, also Roman. The ruins of Cyrrhus are a few minutes west of the Subun river, which with one of its tributaries strengthened the defences of the town on the north and east. On the south a double wall extended from the river to the castle, which stands on a low hill and dominated the town on the west. The castle was repaired by Justinian, and in it the entire tenth legion had its quarters. Within the town walls are the ruins of several large structures. The theatre was built into the east side of the castle hill. From it a colonnade ran northward, ending near the ruins of a large building, north of which is a temple-close built of basalt. Two churches stood at the northeast of the temple-close. An aqueduct ran into the town from the north. Outside of the town, near the river, were the baths, and south of the castle is a nearly perfect tower, hexagonal in plan and having two stories. Except for the doorway to the north, the ground floor has blank walls. An inner stairway leads to the second stage. On the angles of the second stage are piers, with arches between them, which support a strong moulding. The roof resembles a truncated hexagonal pyramid, and is crowned by a sheaf. The tower now serves as the shrine of Huro Peghamber, a Moslem saint, after whom the place is named. Adjoining the tower is a courtyard, built for Moslem pilgrims, in the east wall of which is a Greek inscription. It is not improbable that this tower was the shrine of Athena Cyrrhestica.¹ Andronicus of Cyrrhus built the Tower of the Winds, at Athens.² Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrrhus, says in a letter that he built two bridges, colonnades, an aqueduct, and baths for the town.³


Fifteen hours east of Aintab is Birijk, on the east side of the Euphrates. In a lower gallery of the castle is a rude bas-relief representing two men who hold a triple crescent between them. An inscription, now destroyed, formerly occupied a panel beneath the relief, which seems to be Sassanian. Near the top of the castle I found a Greek inscription. In the town are some broken mosaics, representing three of the labors of Hercules, which were brought here from the village of Balkis,

¹ Smith's *Dictionary*, *ibid.*

² Smith's *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Myth.* s.v. "Andronicus."

³ Newman, J. H., *Trials of Theodoret*, p. 828, Ep. 81.

two hours northwest of Birijik. The hill of Balkis is surrounded by ruins. A coin of Zeugma from this place shows a high hill crowned by a shrine, within which is a statue. This representation is correct, for the actual hill remains, and a cella in its summit marks the probable site of the shrine. The statue also remains, though not *in situ*, its base being near the cella, while its head and armless body are far below on the hill-side. This statue represented Athena. South of the hill are several rock-cut tombs, and west of the hill is a gorge, in which



Outline of the Tchoban Teppe relief, and sketch-map of the region.

are several more, one of which has the bas-relief portraits, and the names, in Greek, of its former occupants.

There is reason to believe that Zeugma stood at Balkis, and not where it is commonly mapped; first, because the ferry is more practicable; and second, because of the extent of the ruins. A peculiar pier, to which a bridge of boats might have been fastened, is to be seen here.

Djibin is seven hours north of Balkis and three hours east of the Euphrates. The road from the east to Rüm-kale terminates at the village of Beli-sar (wrongly spelled Belasir), which

is connected with Rüm-kale by a ferry. Mr. Sanders noted that Beli-sar may be on the site of an older town, named after Belisarius, in memory of his campaign against the Persians, about 543 A. D.

Four hours north of Roum-kale is the village of Elif, where is a Roman monument or shrine. It is square in plan, and has two stages, the lower of which is a cella with a doorway to the east. A side elevation of the structure shows the second stage built on the wall of the second stage. In it is an arch supported by two small pilasters, each of which has a larger pilaster flanking it. Three mouldings ornament the building. The first is near the ground, and the second marks the floor level of the second stage. Beneath it is a frieze of fifty-one human heads, and in some of its interspaces are objects, apparently symbolic. The third moulding crowns the wall of the second stage. Beneath it, on the north wall, are two square panels, in each of which is a head of Medusa. Though the roof of this building is almost destroyed, we are able to form some idea of its appearance from a coin of Kommagene, which bears on its obverse a representation of the monument at Elif, with "Elif" written in Greek below it.

A Roman road, which probably joined the Germanicia-Samossata road, passes immediately north of the Elif monument. A Roman road from Doliche perhaps crossed this road and continued to Otacusum (Behesne).¹ One hour west of Elif, by the first mentioned road, is the village of Hassan Oghlu, where is a second monument. This resembles that of Elif in plan but differs in style, being Roman Corinthian. The door to the cella opens to the south, and on the wall near it are the Greek characters "AYTOK." Above the first stage only the north arch is left. Near this monument are said to be several sarcophagi in a vault.

Northeast of Elif is a small monument near the village of Hissar. It differs from the first two in that the openings of the second stage are rectangular. It also has less ornament. The high roof is like a truncated square pyramid, concave in outline, and topped by a sheaf. This building is nearly per-

¹ For reference consult Kiepert, *Karte von Kleinasiān*, D. IV Adana, and D. V Haleb; also Ramsay, *Historical Geog. of Asia Minor*, vol. iv, p. 267.

fect, as only one stone is lacking. The unit of measurement in these three buildings is the diameter of the large pilaster. In the vicinity are ruins of churches and monasteries, similar to those across the Euphrates north of Djibin. These remains perhaps mark the site of an unidentified town.

Four hours south of Behesne are the two villages of Suyntlu, and between them is a ruined monastery. The chapel and apse are fairly well preserved, the apse being seven-sided in plan and vaulted in seven planes, four of which have each a small arched window. The central plane has two windows, one above the other.

In the apse are two inscriptions, one in Syriac on the right wall, and the other in Greek on the left wall; they read eastward, and meet on the left jamb of the upper window. Above this window is a stone inscribed in Syriac. At each end of this stone is a vertical line of lettering, and between them is a circular line of lettering enclosing a cross. Near the chapel are two rock-cut tombs, in one of which is a Ganymede on the ceiling.

Marash stands in a wide, deep cut of Akher Dagh, and extends downward to the plain. In the castle is a Hittite stele, and in the town are two other Hittite stones. The outskirts of the city, to the east and south, seem to have been sites of former towns. The Marash plain is T-shaped, and its stem extends south toward Giaour gul (or infidel lake), west of which is a smaller lake not hitherto mapped. In rainy weather the two lakes join. In this plain are about twelve mounds, one of the largest lying near the Fundejak road. Southeast of Marash is the upper Bazarjik plain. In it are about nine mounds, the largest of which (known as Eski Khan) seems to be especially worthy of investigation.

In June of 1906 I left Marash to look for the reliefs¹ designated on Dr. Kiepert's map as west of Tchoban Teppe. I tried to follow Dr. Puchstein's route, but concluded that either he followed it in exceptionally dry weather, or that his route was elsewhere, as an impassable swamp extends south from Altyn Kopru for four hours.


¹ No reliefs could be found in this place, though I spent four hours in a careful examination of it.

The only road going south from Marash to the lower Bazarjik plain runs past Karatash tepessi, and thence skirts the east side of the plain to the Koyumji ford of the Ak Su, whence one enters the lower Bazarjik plain. Owing to the dangerous bogs, travelers should not try to cross this plain without a guide.

In the lower Bazarjik plain are several mounds, the two largest of which are those at Fan-fas village and at Kara Huyuk village south of Fan-fas. Southeast of Fan-fas is a low mound surrounded by swamp. East of this mound, at the foot of Tchoban Teppe, near the mill, is a relief on a black stone about forty-six inches long by twenty-two inches broad, and about twelve inches thick. The stone lies face upward and has a semi-circular top; its lower right-hand corner, including part of the left foot of the figure, is lacking. The right side of the figure is turned up to the spectator, and represents a king (or god?) who is about to slay a lamb which he holds in his left hand. In his right hand is a sword. A scabbard on his left side hangs from a belt which girds the waist. He is clad in a long, plain robe. The right shoe has the toe turned up. Another relief somewhat similar is reported to be in the neighborhood.

The placing of the mounds in these plains of Marash and Bazarjik seems to have been carefully considered, as all natural routes into them are guarded by mounds. In some cases one or more mounds stand at the foot of a pass. For instance, take Marash itself, where are two mounds and a castle, and the mound at Tekerek, which guarded the roads to the north of the Marash plain. In the plains proper, the sites which seem to be most important are wholly or in part surrounded by artificial swamps, as can be clearly seen at Eski-Khan and Fan-fas.

I wish to thank Dr. von Luschan of Berlin, and Pastor E. Lohman of Freienwalde a-Oder, who have kindly translated several inscriptions which I found, and which I expect to publish later.



REGION OF MERSINA AND GUZNEY.

Report on an Aramaic Boundary Inscription in Cilicia.—By
JAMES A. MONTGOMERY, Ph.D., Professor in the Philadelphia Divinity School.

The inscription here communicated was found by Mr. J. Renwick Metheny in Cilicia, at Guzne, a place lying somewhat to the east of the point where it is marked upon Kiepert's large road map, being situated about midway between Mersina, the chief port of Cilicia, and the inland town of Nemrun (the Armenian Lampron), at the distance of about ten miles, as the crow flies, from either place. Mr. Metheny and his colleague Dr. S. Badeer, to whom great credit is due for their patient care, made several copies of the inscription and also took wax rubbings. These impressions, where legible, give authentic copies of the characters, and are of first value; but in several cases the copies have noted characters in whole or part which do not appear in the rubbings, the latter having suffered in transportation. Accordingly I give in the accompanying plates, first a reproduction of the wax impressions, and second a replica of the best of the copies.¹ As some critical points of the inscription still defy interpretation, I herewith submit as brief a report as possible, with the hope that some early expedition will be able to fill out the lacunae in our copies.

The inscription is carved, with sunken letters, in the smoothed surface of the natural rock, on the side of the road. The characters, which are from two to three inches in height, resemble

¹ Mr. Metheny placed the inscription in the hands of Dr. Jastrow, who most generously committed it to the present writer for decipherment. An earlier and most imperfect copy was forwarded to Prof. Clermont-Ganneau, who made a painstaking attempt at decipherment; but the copy was too poor to allow him to identify more than two or three words. The wax rubbings have been presented to the Museum of the University of Pennsylvania, where a cast of them has been made. To Dr. Torrey I am much indebted for his criticisms of my first essays at interpretation, based upon the faulty copies, and he first discovered the key of the last line.

THE GUZNEY INSCRIPTION. PHOTOGRAPH OF CAST MADE FROM WAX IMPRESSION.



most closely those of the Cilician Chase Inscription (Lidzbarski, Plate XXVI, No. 3), and of the Lycian inscription (CIS. II. 109). The letters are very uneven in size, and there is no word-spacing. The rubbings being in small sections, have not allowed me to space exactly in my copy.

The first line is legible, with uncertainty only in the case of the last word. I read, **עד תנה תחום רנל**: "Up to here the boundary of RNL." **תנה** is found in the Chase Inscription. The last word is a place-name, to be read RNL, or DNL; the former I believe to be preferable, and I am inclined to identify it with Lampron-Nemrun. The stone gives us then a boundary inscription, of the same category as Clermont-Ganneau's Gezer inscriptions.¹

In line 2, I read as the first three words: **"ומן י אתה"** "Whosoever thou art who." A similar phrase is found twice in the Nerab inscriptions (A, 5: B, 8).² As in those inscriptions, we expect this indefinite relative to refer to a possible mutilator of the inscription. The first letter following this group of words looks like a **ה**, and would then introduce the second person imperfect, as in the Nerab inscriptions. What the verb is, is at present undecipherable. I take it that at the end of the line and the beginning of the next comes the verb of the apodosis, the subject following. The **ה**, the fourth letter of the third line, would represent the object of this verb or of the preposition **ל** (the third person replacing the second, as in the Nerab inscriptions). We may then conjecture that the reading was somewhat of this nature: "Whoever thou art who wilt mutilate, him destroy the god." At all events the divine name appears in the middle of the third line, as **בעל שמיין**, i. e., the Celestial Baal, so well known in the Phoenician and Palmyrene inscriptions. (The last two letters of **בעל** have evidently run into each other with the wearing of the stone.)

For the first word in the fourth line, **רנא** can be read with fair certainty; this gives then an epithet of the deity.³ For

¹ Chwolson, *Corpus inscriptionum Hebraicarum*, No. 2.

² Compare the Assyrian, *mannu atta šarru*, Behistun, 105 (German, wer du bist immer König sein wirst).

³ The same epithet appears for the Sun in de Vogüé, *Syrie Centrale: Inscriptions sémitiques. Palmyra*, No. 185.

שֶׁהָר וִשְׁמַשׁ, i. e., moon and sun, in the same order as in the Nerab inscription A, 9. For the present I pass over this most interesting theological reference, and the close association of those astral deities with the Celestial Baal.

For the fifth line, both copy and rubbing agree in giving an intelligible text: וְלֹזְרֻעָא ז' לְהָ: "and his seed." This gives the conclusion of the curse, which is to extend to the offender's offspring; compare the Nerab inscriptions, where also is found the idiom ז' לְ.

I conclude with the transliteration and translation of the text.

TRANSLITERATION.

1. עַד תְּנֵה תְּחוּם רְנֵל
2. וּמְן ז' אֲתָה תְּצַבּוּ --
3. פְּנֵלָה בְּעֵל שְׁמֵן
4. רְכָא שְׁהָר וְשְׁמַשׁ
5. וְלֹזְרֻעָא ז' לְהָ

TRANSLATION.

1. Up to here the boundary of RNL.
2. And whoever thou art who wilt [destroy, over-
3. whelm] him Be'el-Šamén,
4. the great, Moon and Sun,
5. and his seed.



Fig. 1. From the Wax Impression.

תְּקִוָּן אֶרְאֵל תְּבִנָּה קְדֻשָּׁה
עַמְּדָה עַמְּדָה אֲזִזָּה וְגַדְלָה
קְדֻשָּׁה קְדֻשָּׁה טְהֹרָה
טְהֹרָה טְהֹרָה קְדֻשָּׁה
קְדֻשָּׁה קְדֻשָּׁה קְדֻשָּׁה

Fig. 2. From Mr. Metheny's copy.

A Hymn to Nergal.—By J. DYNELEY PRINCE, Professor in Columbia University, New York.

THE god Nergal, in whose praise the following hymn (*British Museum Texts*, vol. xv, pl. 14) was composed, had his residence at Cutha, according to numerous passages in the cuneiform literature and also to II. K. xvii, 24–36. The ancient king of Uruk= Erech (modern Warka), Singāmil (*ca.* 2750 B.C.)¹ was also a devoted adherent of the Nergal-cult, and made various improvements and additions to the temple of this god at Cutha, as well as fostering his worship at Uruk itself (see Jastrow, *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, p. 66, and, especially, Thureau-Dangin, *Inscriptions de Sumer et d'Akkad* 1905, p. 316).

The present all-Sumerian hymn, whose translation, so far as I know, has not been attempted before, describes Nergal as being ‘lord of the decree of Uruk,’ obv. 9, which means merely ‘the tutelary deity of Uruk.’ In fact, the poem especially states that Nergal has set a protecting net about his city (obv. 10, 11, gloss), which plainly indicates the city of Uruk, and not, in this case, the more usually mentioned shrine of Cutha. For this reason, it may, I think, be supposed that this hymn dates from the period of the Uruk dynasty, perhaps from the time of Singāmil himself (note on this epoch, Hilprecht, *Mathematical, Metrological and Chronological Tablets*, p. 316). Our hymn, then, is peculiarly important from an historical point of view, as being a survival of a Nergal-cult which was in all probability not indigenous.

The reason for the exploitation of Nergal at Uruk probably lies in the fact that the god Lugal-banda, alluded to by Singāśid, a predecessor of Singāmil’s in the Uruk dynasty, appeared as a local deity of Uruk, and this Lugal-banda had certain characteristics which suggested those of the better known

¹ See, however, Hilprecht, *Mathematical, Metrological and Chronological Tablets*, p. 316.

Nergal of Cutha (see Jastrow, *op. cit.* p. 95). Here it should be noted that Lugal-banda (*banda* = TUR-DA) means 'powerful (*banda*) king' (*lujal*). On *banda* see below, Commentary on line 30. The name Nergal undoubtedly also meant 'great (*gal*) lord' (*ner-nir* = *bēlu* 'lord,' Prince, *Materials for a Sumerian Lexicon*,¹ 262; perhaps cognate with *nun* = *rūbi* 'prince,' *op. cit.* 263). Such a possibly accidental coincidence in meaning between these names and perhaps also certain as yet unknown peculiarities of Lugal-banda, the god local to Uruk, may have given rise to the merging of the Lugal-banda-cult with the Nergal-cult in Uruk.

The writing of the name Nergal in the form *Ner-unu-gal* (see line 38 below) means 'lord of the lower world'; literally: 'great place' (*unu*), and may have been a later amplification of the shorter form *Ner-gal*. To this god and his consort *Allatu* was assigned the dominion over the lower world which was called 'the great place,' owing to its enormous extent, necessary to contain the souls of all dead human beings.

This hymn is particularly interesting also from the fact that the fiery nature of Nergal (Jastrow, p. 67: Nergal is called 'glowing flame') is especially emphasized (note lines 35-37). Nergal's destructive tendencies are also well described in the reverse, where he is the overwhelming fire and not the fructifying warmth of the sun. Here it should be noted that Dr. Williams Hayes Ward has identified Nergal with a god who appears on the cylinders as surrounded by fire, holding an enemy by the beard, and pushing him against a mountain. It is interesting to observe that Dr. Ward believes in an Elamitic origin for Nergal.

The difference in character between this hymn and those published and discussed by Dr. Josef Böllenerücher (*Gebete und Hymnen an Nergal*, 1904) is distinctly worthy of notice. The text of the present document is not in good condition and presents many difficulties, a solution of some of which, it is hoped, has herein been suggested with at least approximate correctness.

¹ Indicated throughout this paper by P.

PLATE 14. NO. 22741.

OBVERSE.

1. šu-lig(KAL) ta-me-(a)
the mighty one, what is he?
2. šu-lig(KAL) ta-me-(a)
the mighty one, what is he?
3. gal šā(Ù) mulu šu-lig(m)-ma
great the ancient one, he who is mighty.
4. šā(Ù) mulu šu-lig(m)-ma
the ancient one, he who is mighty.
5. ra šā(Ù) mulu šu-lig(m)-ma
the ancient one, he who is mighty.
6. ra šā(Ù) mulu šu-lig(m)-ma
the ancient one, he who is mighty.
7. šā(Ù) mulu šu-lig(m)-ma
the ancient one, he who is mighty.
8. šā(Ù) mulu šu-lig(m)-ma
the ancient one, he who is mighty.
9. en sal-dug(KA)-ku (*Uruk*)-ki-ga šā(Ù) mulu šu-lig(m)-ma
Lord of the decree of Erech; the ancient one, he who is mighty.
10. šu-lig(m) iši-bar-ra sa ga-ak(AK)
The mighty one, the dust divider; the net he fashioneth;
11. tup(KU)-pa im-ma tub(KU)-ba eri-na ki- // sa ne-ku-ku
As a double garment (a garment for his city, etc.) the net he setteth.
12. te-(ba)-ru-ub-ga-en te-ba-zi-gi-en
What is like unto thee? What is like unto thee?
13. u-mu-un-mu su-zí ki e-ne ne-gurru(?)
O my lord of glory! He is the one who overthroweth.
14. i-de zi-da-zu ib-ni ba-an-gid(BU)
As for thy right eye, its wrath is long enduring.
15. lig(KAL) tuk šu-gid(BU)-zu šeš-e ba-an-si
Thou who art mighty, thy penetrating host is fraught with evil.
16. ur-sig(MU) šu-lig(KAL) nu-zu-ra mu-un-na-an-gi-gi
Hero, mighty one; against him who knoweth him not he turneth.

- . 17. *e-gal-la šu-dim*(PAP-PAP) *nu-zu-ra mu-un-na-gi-gi*
The mighty structure; against him who knoweth not he turneth.
18. *kud ešemén* (KI-E-NE-DI) *nu-zu-ra mu-un-na-an-gi-gi*
With exultant judgment, against him who knoweth him not he turneth.
19. *me-e te-là(LAL)-bi i-de-mu mu-un-kud gu(KA)-mu mu-un-kud*
The utterance of that gallū cutteth my eye; cutteth my mouth.
20. *zag-si-mu te-là(LAL) -xul du-e te-ba dur(KU)-ru-ne-eš*
My full (powered) chief! That evil gallū's going what things can abide?
21. *è-na-ka sar-mu-un-na-ra*
. of his house goeth forth.
22. *-ta udu-šù-a-ni sar-mu-un-na-ra*
From . . . his setting goeth forth.
23. *al . . . nag-a-ni sar-mu-un-na-ra*
. of his drinking (?) goeth forth.
24. *a-(na) zid(KU)-da ga-ra-ba-ku*
. what with thee can abide?

REVERSE.

25. *gi-ra-na zid(KU)-? ga-ra-da-ku*
with thee (?) can abide?
26. *Kankal(KI-KAL) li-bi-ir ri ak(AK) a-na zid(KU)-da ga-ra-da-ku*
The fruitful earth, the ruler maketh destruction of it; what with thee can abide?
27. *ki li-bi-ir ri-ùr-ku ak(AK) a-na zid(KU) ? ga-ra-da-ku*
The land the ruler curseth with a mighty gripping blast; what with thee can abide?
28. *kankal (KI-KAL?) ne-ra ukib-bi ??a-nazid(KU)-da ga-ra-da-ku*
Fruitful earth . . . power of vegetation . . . What with thee can abide?
29. *lig-lig di mu-ub-ra(DU) a mu-lu mu-ga-a-an-sar*
Truly mighty with judgment he goeth; a father (?) who goeth forth.

30. *lig en banda* (TUR-DA) *gur-ru-na-ta te me-e gu* (KA)-*di*
 The mighty one, the strong lord, when he overthroweth,
 what is it that he saith?
31. *er(A-ŠI)-ra nam-ba-da-ku xul-bil* (NE) *er(A-ŠI)-da ku-*
ma-da
 For weeping he is clothed; with evil fire for weeping he is
 clothed.
32. *er(A-ŠI)-da a-nir-da ku-ma-da er(A-ŠI)-da ku-ma-da*
 For weeping, for lamentation he is clothed; for weeping he
 is clothed.
33. *ša(LIBBU) mu ša(U)-li-ne ku-ma-da er(A-ŠI)-da ku-ma-da*
 The heart of the man (god) is clothed with a gathering of
 fire; for weeping he is clothed.
34. *maš nu za(NI)-la gi(= zi ?)-da ku-ma-da er(A-ŠI)-da ku-*
ma-da
 The leader who shineth; with justice he is clothed; for weep-
 ing he is clothed.
35. *giš-a-am dimmer-giš bil-ga dub ku-ma-da er(A-ŠI)-da ku-*
ma-da
 Verily he is mighty; a strong god, with a fiery surrounding
 he is enveloped; for weeping he is clothed.
36. *a-lig* (KAL) *ku-zu nu-uš ne-in-tuk maš zu-ni-eš mi-in-mal*
 (IK)
 Powerful one who verily is a prince of wisdom; leader who
 has wrought wisely.
37. *giš-a-am dimmer-giš bil-ga dub ku-zu nu-uš ne-in-tuk maš-*
zu-ni-eš mi-in-mal (IK).
 Verily he is mighty; a strong god, surrounded by fire; a
 prince of wisdom; leader who hath wrought wisely.
38. XXXVII, . . . *er(A-ŠI)-lib (m)-ma dimmer Ner- (unu-*
gal.
 thirty-seven (lines). Penitential hymn to the god Nergal.

COMMENTARY.

OBVERSE.

1. *Šu-lig* can only mean 'mighty;' *šu* = 'hand, power,' Br., 7069; *lig*(KAL) = *dannu* 'powerful,' Br. 6194. On the value *lig* = KAL, see P. 223-4. Note Br. 7188: *ŠU-KAL*, with val. *šugubru* = *abāru* 'be powerful.' It is possible,

however, that ŠU-KAL was also sometimes read *šu-kal*, because the combination seems to appear in *papsukal* ‘powerful protector.’ See Prince, JBL xxiii. 74, note 5. The value of KAL in the present inscription is probably *lig* (see below on line 3).

Tu me-a ‘what is (he)?’ *Tu = minū* ‘what?’, IV. 30, 12a; 15a. Note also *tu-a-an = tu-am*, Muss-Arnolt, 556a. The interrogative element *tu* is probably connected with *te* in *te-ba* (see below on line 12).

Me-a = bašn ‘to be,’ Br. 10549 and note on rev. 30. This is ES. for EK. *me-en = bašn*, P. Introd. ii. § 4, 71.

3. *Šu* (U) = *labīru* ‘ancient,’ Br. 9465. I read ES. *mulu* ‘who’ for the man-sign, Br. 6398 (see Br. 1340; *mulu* = relative pron. *ša*). Note P. 244, s.v. *mulu*.

In *šu-lig(m)-ma*, the final consonant of *lig(m)* was clearly a nasal, as indicated by the corroborative suffix *-ma*. This seems to fix the reading *lim*, perhaps *ling*, for KAL. Note above on line 1.

9. After *en* the signs seem clearly to be *sal-dug(KA)-ku = sal-dug-gu*, which I regard as a variant of Br. 10921; *sal-dug(KA)-ga = kunnū* ‘duly appoint’; *taknītu* ‘duly appointed spouse’; cf. Prince, JAOS. xxiv. 111. *Sal* is the abstract prefix, because, as the feminine sign, it indicates a thing in general; note the Vergilian line *varium et mutabile semper femina*. On the abstract use of *sal*, see Br. 10955: *sal-šāg = damqātu* ‘favor’; 10958: *sal-xul = limuttu* ‘evil.’ In *sal-dug(KA)-gu(KU)*, we have the abstract *sal-dug* (KA) ‘speak, word,’ P. 89, and *gu* (KU), which may also mean ‘word,’ as the sound *gu* = KA. *Sal-dug-gu*, then, means ‘utterance, decree.’

(*Uruk)-ki-ga* = ‘of Erech.’ The remains of the *Uruk*-sign, for which see Amiaud, 51, are quite clear here. See above Introduction on Nergal’s connection with *Uruk-Erech*.

10. *Iši* (IŠ)-*bar-ra* can only mean ‘dust-divider’ or ‘scatterer.’ Cf. *iši* = IŠ = *épru* ‘dust,’ Br. 5083. *Bar*, whose primary meaning is ‘divide, penetrate’ (P. 53-4) = *parāsu* ‘separate,’ Br. 1786.

Sa = šētu ‘net,’ Br. 3083 (‘something twined together,’ P. 278). *Ga* in *ga-ak* is the prefix, but not necessarily with precative force; Br. 273: *ga-ba-an-ru-ru* (KAK-KAK) = *iqyar*;

1697: *ga-ti-li-ne-en* = *aballut*. See also P. xxvii on optative *ga-*. *Ak* = AK is the usual word for *epēšu* 'do, make,' Br. 2778.

11. *Tup(KU)-pa* is explained by the gloss as being equivalent to *tub(KU)-ba*. The writing is KU-pa; gloss KU-ba. Note *ku-ba*, Br. 10567 = *nalbašu* 'garment'; 10568: *lubuštu* 'clothing.' On the value *tub* = KU = *lubuštu*, *cubātu*, *nalbašu*, see Br. 10512 and P. 334, s.v. *tub*. The 'double (*im*) garment' means 'an all-enveloping garment,' explained by the gloss as being 'for his city' = *eri-na*. The following *ki* means most probably 'etc.,' indicating that the gloss-reading is to be followed by the words of the text; *sa ne-ku-ku*. The same use of *ki* occurs in Nimrod epic, xi. 143-145.

It is quite clear that the qualifying signs to *ku-pa* are *im-ma*. This is *im*, Br. 4816. Note Br. 4821, this *im=šandū* 'double.'

I regard *ku-ku* in *ne-ku-ku* as being equivalent to *ku-ku* = *calālu* 'set,' Br. 10645, or perhaps better to *ku* = *nadū* 'set,' Br. 10542, which could very well be used of setting a net, in this instance for the protection of the god's city.

12. *Te-ba* (*ba* not clear, but evident) I must regard as meaning 'what?' Note *te=minū* 'what?', Br. 7697, clearly cognitive with *ta=minū* 'what' (see above on lines 1-2). The element *-rub-* is most puzzling. In view of the second half of this line: *te-ba-zi-gi-en* 'who is like unto thee?' (*zi=za-e* 'thee' + *gēn=gim*, postposition 'like'), I must consider *-rub-* to be a variant of the more ordinary infix of the 2 p. *-rab-* (rhotacism for *zab*, P. xxxii). *Te-ba* also occurs, obv. 20 below. *Ga-en*, then, is probably like *gi-en=gēn*, a variant of the postposition *gim* 'like unto.' For *tebaziġēn*, cf. vol. xv, pl. 15, obv. 21: *a-ba-zi-gi-en te-ba* 'who like thee can attack?', where *te-ba=te-gá(MAL)=tixū* 'attack,' Br. 7726.

13. *Su-zi* = *šalummatu* 'splendor, glory,' Br. 187, clearly cognate with *su-ši* = *šalummatu*, Br. 235. This variation between *z* and *š* is a plain indication of the spoken character of Sumerian.

Ki e-ne ne-gurru. I am very uncertain as to this phrase. *Ki* may be rel. *ša* 'the one who,' as in Sc. 273. *E-ne* then is 'ne,' P. 102. I believe that the last sign in the line = *gur+ru*. Note rev. 30, where *gur-ru* must = *sakāpu* 'overthrow,' Br. 3355. Here *gur-ru* is plainly written out. Our sign, in obv. 13, cannot be *tab-ru*, as the two preceding horizontals are not

even, the lower one projecting, as would be the case with GUR rather than with *tab*.

14. *I-de*(ES.) = énu 'eye,' Br. 4004 = EK. *igi* = SI. *Zi-da* may mean 'right' (not left), Br. 2312, but it might mean *kēnu* 'firm, just,' Br. 2313. *Zu* is evidently the suffix of the 2 p. here.

In 14b, we find a most interesting gloss. The sign, I believe, is *ib*(TUM), but written without precedent with three corner-wedges in the last part of the sign. This probably suggested the sign with value *zib* = šimtu 'dusk,' Br. 4689. Another *zib*-sign, Br. 8195, also = šimtan 'dusk.' The glossator, therefore, started to explain the unusual sign for *ib* in 14b, by the two characters *zi-ib*, but, realizing his error, erased the *zi*, leaving only *ib* = the correct pronunciation. The erased sign, I think, was probably *zi* and not *gi*. For the real *gi* sign, see the gloss at the end of the line on BU. This *ib* = nuggatu 'wrath,' Br. 4950; ugguatu 'wrath,' Br. 4961. On the value *i-ib*, see P. 184.

Ba-an-BU, glossated *gi-id*, can only mean 'long' = arāku, Br. 7511 (P. 141).

15. The second sign here seems to be a combination of *tuk* = išā 'be, have,' Br. 11237 + the upright šū = kisšatu 'host,' Br. 10832. The combination ŠU-BU-zu must mean šu-gid(BU)-zu 'thy (zu) powerful (gid = BU = kabtu, Br. 7518) host' = šū. On *bu*, see also on line 14, just above.

Šeš-e. Šeš can mean dāmu 'blood,' Br. 6439, or limnu 'evil,' Br. 6440. Cf. IV. 2, 51b; 57b; šeš-si = limnu 'evil,' 'be full of evil.' The *e*-suffix in šeš-e is probably merely a suffix denoting the *nomen unitatis*. Note on *du-e*, below in line 20. Šeš-e ban-si can only mean 'is fraught with evil' (for mankind).

16. *Ur-sig*(MU) is interesting. Note pl. xvii. obv. 5: *ur-mu-sag=ur-sag* 'hero,' where possibly *-sag* is merely an indication that *mu* has the *s-g* value, perhaps here as in pl. 14, obv. 16, MU = *sig*. Note Br. 1124: *mu* = *sig*, doubtful. My reading here MU = *sig* would confirm this *sig*-value for MU. If this is really *sig*, probably *ur* was pronounced *ur*. On the other hand, *ur-mu* could mean 'hero of name,' 'celebrated hero,' as *mu* = šumu, Br. 1235.

Nu-zu + postposition *-ra* must be a participial construction = 'to him who knoweth not;' viz., 'against him who is not the devotee of the god.'

Mun-nan-gi-gi. *Gi* = the gunated *gi = tāru* 'turn,' Br. 6331; cf. also Br. 6336.

17. To designate a god as *e-gal* 'temple,' lit. 'great house'; 'great structure' seems strange, but was perhaps applied here alluding to the great mass of the fiery storm.

Dr. Robert Lau regards the fourth sign here as a composite writing of PAP-PAP = *dim*, Br. 1166. This is probably correct, as *šu* 'power' (see on line 1 above) + *dim*(PAP-PAP) = *šurbū* 'mighty,' Br. 1166, make a possible pleonastic adjectival combination. This, of course, qualifies *e-gal*.

18. *Kud* or *tar* has as its primary meaning 'cut, separate,' P. 211. Here, as in line 19, it seems to indicate the smiting power of the god. Note Br. 372: *kud = nakāsu* 'cut off.' *Kud* in line 18 may mean 'judgment, power of decision' = *dīnu*, Br. 365.

Ešemén = KI-E-NE-DI, Br. 9747, wrongly read by Brünnow *menartu*. Rather *melultu* 'joy,' probably from *alālu* (see Muss-Arnolt, 549-550). The word *ešemén* can only mean 'that which is (mén) joy' = *eše*, evidently cognate with *ešeš* = KU-XUL, Br. 10658 (P. 109). This *eše(ešeš)* must be carefully distinguished from *eš = er = A-ŠI*, Br. 11602 (P. 108) 'weep' (see below lines 31-2). *Kud = ešemén* can mean then 'with cutting or judgment of joy' = 'exultant judgment.'

19. *Me-e*, probably = *qāltu* 'utterance,' Br. 10370, this *me* being cognate with *e-me = lišdnu* 'tongue' (*me* preceded by the abstract vowel). See P. 236.

Tē-lā(LAL) = gallū 'destructive demon,' Br. 7732, usually read in Sumerian *galla* in EK.; *mulla*(?) in ES. (P. 120). The epithet *gallū* applied to Nergal here denotes the god's power to annihilate.

Gu(KA) = pā 'mouth,' Br. 538. See below on rev. 30: *gu-di*.


20. *Zag* is probably for *sag* 'head.' Note *zag = ZAG*, Br. 6468 = *ašdrīdu* 'chief.' *Zag-si*, lit. 'full chief,' as *si = malū* 'be full,' Br. 3393.

Tē-lā(LAL)-xul=limnu 'evil,' Br. 9502, is a very common combination.

Du-e = du = alāku 'go,' Br. 4871, with the specifying suffix -*e*, as above in line 15, s.v. *šeš-e*.

Dur(KU)-ru must = *ašdbu* 'dwell, abide,' Br. 10580(10523). The idea is 'who can abide' or 'live'? Note that *dur(KU)-ru-ne-eš* is plural: 'what things can abide'?

21. *Sar-mu-mu-na-ra* in these lines must be a postpositive conjugation of *sar* = *acū* 'go forth,' Br. 4302. See also on rev. 29. Note, moreover, that SAR in this sense has also the value *mu*, P. 241.


22. The sign *-ta* preceded by  must mean 'from' or 'in.'

For *udu-šu* 'setting' (of the sun), see obv. 24 and note also vol. xv, pl. 10, obv. 15. These mutilated lines are obscure.

23. *Nag-a-ni* 'his drinking' (?) The sign is quite plainly *nag*, Br. 868; also = *immeli*, Br. 867, and denotes 'drink.' The sense is not clear.

24. *A-(na) zid-da ga-ra-ba-ku*. On this, see just below.

REVERSE.

25. The sign  appears to precede *-gi-ra-na*. See above on line 22.

Inasmuch as the following lines, 26-28, show plainly the combination *Ku-da* = *zid-da*, which, in view of the context, must mean 'with thee,' the occurrence after *zid(KU)* of the GA-sign containing TUK in 25: 27 rev. is very strange. Are we to regard *zid(KU)* + this unusual sign as being synonymous with *zid(KU)-da* of 26: 28? The context seems to indicate such a possibility. The strange sign may in fact be an erroneous writing for *da* (?).

Note that in 24, we find the prefixes *ga-ra-ba* = *ku*. This *ku* must be KU (perhaps with val. *tuš*) = *ašdbu* 'dwell, abide,' Br. 10523. That is to say, in lines 26-27: *a-na zid(KU)-da ga-ra-da-ku* means 'what (*a-na*) can abide with thee?' a rhetorical question bearing on the greatness of the deity. *zi-da* probably stands for *za-e* + *da* like *zi* above in 12.

26. *Kankal* = KI-KAL, Br. 9754. The combination means 'powerful' or 'fruitful earth' (P. 179, s.v. *xirim*). Note that KI-KAL = *terigtu*, Br. 9761, 'green vegetation, verdure.' The sense seems to be that *libir* = *ligir*, Br. 6964, per-

haps = 'governor, artificer' (P. 224) + 'destroys' (*ri ak* 'make destruction'). Note *ri* = *ziq šāri* 'windblast,' iv. 5, 35a. The god is seemingly conceived of as causing a fiery blast over the *kankal* = 'fruitful land.' Note rev. 33, where the god is described as being literally clothed in fire.

27. Here *ki* = 'land,' *ireitn*, Br. 9631, is suggested by the preceding *kankal* = KI-KAL (line 26). The governor makes a mighty (*ku*) seizing (*ur*) blast (*ri*) over the land. *Ri-ur-ku+uk* 'make' is simply a combination verb, so common in Sumerian. Note that *ur* = *xamānu* 'seize,' Br. 11890. *Ku* = *rubn* 'mighty,' Br. 10547.

28. This line is very obscure. The sense seems to be that Nergal destroys the fruitful earth and also the *u-kib* 'power of vegetation' or the germinating property of the soil. *U* = *šammu* 'plant,' perhaps with val. *šam*, Br. 6027 + *kib* 'double,' cf. Thureau-Dangin, No. 170-171, showing the original crossed sign = 'double.' Note also Br. 5219: *kib-kib-ki* = *duxxudu ša mirsi* 'flourish,' said of the *mirsu*-plant (P. 203). The combination *u-kib* 'plant-increase' occurs also in vol. xv, pl. 19, obv. 6; rev. 5-6, where the same sense seems clear.

The broken signs at the end of line 26 here may have indicated some verb 'to devastate.'

29. *Lig-lig* 'very mighty.' See on obv. 1.

Di 'with judgment' = *dēnu*, Br. 9525.

Mu-ub-ra(DU) 'he goeth'; cf. pl. 19, rev. 8: *mu-ur-ra-ra* (DU-DU).

Does *a* in 29b = *abu* 'father'? See Br. 11324 and P. 4.

30. *Banda* (TUR-DA) = *ikdu* 'strong,' Br. 4138. The signs mean 'be little, young'; hence, 'strong.' See P. 5-12.

Gur-ru-na-ta = 'in (*ta*) his (*ua*) overthrowing' (*gurru*); cf. *gur* = *sakā-pu* 'overthrow,' Br. 3365, and see above on obv. 13.

Tē me-e 'what is it?' See above on obv. 1-2. On the other hand, *me-e* here may = *qūltu* 'utterance,' as in obv. 19, q.v. The phrase would then read: *tē me-e gu* (KA) *di* 'what utterance doth he utter?'

Gu-di = KA-DE 'pour out mouth.' *Gu* (KA) = *pā* 'mouth' (see on obv. 19) + *di* = DE 'libate, pour out' (Reisner, *Hymnen*, 74).

31. *Er* (A-ŠI) 'water of the eye'; hence 'weeping'; = *bikītu* 'weeping,' Br. 11606; *dimtu* 'tear,' Br. 11609. *Er-ra* seems

to mean 'for (*ra*) weeping'; viz., as a cause of weeping, owing to his destructiveness.

Nam-bu-da-ku probably means 'he verily is clothed,' *nam* not being necessarily negative in force. *Ku=labāšu* 'be clothed,' Br. 10533.

The following refrain *ku-ma-da=ku*, with postpositive conjugation *ma-da*, may indicate that this *ku* was pronounced *tum=tuy*, Br. 10513; i. e., nasalized =*gm*.

Note *er* (A-*S1*)-*da* in the refrain. Perhaps 'he is clothed with (*da*) weeping' = 'he causeth tears.'

32. *A-nir-da* 'for' or 'with lamentation'; cf. Br. 11541= *tašištu* 'lament.' *A-nir* = 'much water' = 'many tears' (P. 263).

33. *Ša=libbu* 'heart, midst,' Br. 7988.

Nu may perhaps be regarded as the same *nu=lu* 'man,' seen in combinations such as *nu-bandu=lapputtū* 'overseer'; *nu-giš-šar* 'gardener,' P. 264. *Nu* may mean 'he is the one' (?). See especially just below on line 34.

Ša(Ù)-li-ne. *Ša(Ù)-li=pazáru Ša išati* 'gather,' said of fire, Br. 9472. I regard -*ne* as the postposition and I translate *ša-li-ne ku-ma-da* 'with a nucleus of fire the heart of the man (god) is clothed,' viz., the god is all fire=destructive force within. Note the modern Arabic expression: *en-nár min juwwa* 'the fire within,' to denote, in this instance, the destructive fire of love.

34. *Muš=ašáridu* 'leader,' B. 1739 = 'the one set aside,' P. 234.

For *nu*, see just above on line 33.

The sign NI is plainly glossated *za*; followed by -*la=za(l)-la* 'shining' = *namáru*, Br. 5319. This idea comes from the primary signification of the sign NI = 'oil' (P. 256). He is a shining chief as the god of fire.

Gi-da is probably an erroneous writing for *zi-da=kittu* 'justice,' Br. 2314. The generally unclear character of this inscription tends to justify such a view, as *gi-da* here makes no sense.

35. Lines 35-36 and 37 are practically identical. The first five signs of 35 are very badly written.

Giš=illu 'mighty,' Br. 5702. *A-am*, usually written *Á-AN* (= *dm*), must be an unusually written form of the asseverative suffix: 'verily he is' or 'was.'

Dimmer-giš=ilu idlu 'mighty god.'

Bil-ga dub 'a surrounding (*dub*) of (*ga*) fire (*bil*).'
Note *bil=išdūn* 'fire,' Br. 4584. *Ga* must be the *nota-genitivus=ge* (KID). *Dub=lumū* 'surround,' Br. 3927. Cf. the Sumerian loanword in Semitic *duppū* 'tablet'='envelope of clay' (P. 87). *Bil-ga dub ku-ma-da*, then, ='he is clothed (*ku*) with a surrounding (*dub*) of fire' (*bil-ga*).

36. *Ku-zu* 'prince of wisdom.' *Ku rubā* 'prince,' Br. 10547; *zu=nimēgi* 'deep wisdom,' Br. 136.

Nu-uš seems to mean here *luman* 'verily,' as in Hrozný, 65 (P. 265); a combination of *nu+ŠID*='without number'='exceedingly, verily.' See on *nu* just above, line 33, and note what seems to be the same word in pl. 19, rev. 17: *in nu-uš* 'he verily is the one who.'

Nēn-tuk 'he is'; *tuk=išu* 'to be,' Br. 11237.

Mās=ašāridu, as in 34, q.v. *Zu-ni-eš* seems to be an adverb with suffix *-eš* 'wisely.'

Min-mal(IK), ES. for *gal=IK=bašū* 'to be,' Br. 2238—'he is'; i. e., 'wisely he is'; 'he behaves wisely.'

37. This line differs only from 35-36 in the omission of the refrain *ku-ma-da* (in 35) and of the expression *a-lib* (in 36).

38. *Er-lib(m)-ma*. Thus correctly Dr. Lau. *Lib=gālu kāru* 'song of woe,' Br. 7271. The entire expression then means 'a weeping (*er*) woe-song'='a penitential psalm.'

On *Ner-(unu)-gal*, see above, Introduction.

GLOSSARY OF SUMERIAN WORDS.

| | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| <i>a=abi</i> , 29. | <i>bil</i> , 35. | <i>e-me</i> , 19. |
| <i>aba</i> , 12. | <i>BU</i> , 14. | <i>en</i> , 9. |
| <i>a-lib</i> , 36. | <i>di=DE</i> , 30. | <i>e-ne</i> , 13. |
| <i>ak</i> , 10, 26. | <i>di</i> , 29. | <i>er=A-ŠI</i> , 18, 31. |
| <i>AK</i> , 10. | <i>dim</i> , 17. | <i>eri</i> , 11. |
| <i>a-am</i> , 35. | <i>dimmer</i> , 35. | <i>er-lib(m)-ma</i> , 38. |
| <i>a-na</i> , 24, 25. | <i>du</i> , 20. | <i>eš</i> , 18. |
| <i>a-nir</i> , 32. | <i>dub</i> , 35. | <i>eše</i> , 18. |
| <i>A-ŠI</i> , 18. | <i>du-e</i> , 15, 20. | <i>ešemén</i> , 18. |
| <i>ban</i> , 14, 15. | <i>dur</i> , 20. | <i>ešeš</i> , 18. |
| <i>banda</i> , 30. | <i>-e</i> , 15, 20. | <i>ga</i> , 10. |
| <i>bar</i> , 10. | <i>e-gal</i> , 17. | <i>-ga</i> , 35. |

| | | |
|-------------------|-----------------|---------------------|
| GA, 25. | kud, 18. | sal-dug-gu, 9. |
| gaban, 10. | ku-ku, 11. | sar, 21. |
| ga-en, 12. | ku-zu, 36. | SAR, 21. |
| gal=IK, 36. | LAL, 19. | si, 21 |
| galla, 19. | libir, 26. | su-ši, 13. |
| garuba-, 24. | lig, 1, 29. | su-zl, 13. |
| garudu-, 25. | ligir, 26. | ša, 3. |
| ge=KID, 35. | -ma-da, 31. | ša=libbu, 33. |
| gén, 12. | MAL, 12. | ša(Ł)-li, 33. |
| gi-da, 34. | mal=IK, 36. | šam, 28. |
| gid=BU, 14. | maš, 34, 36. | šeš-e, 15. |
| gi-gi, 16. | me='speak', 19. | šeš-si, 15. |
| gim, 12. | me-a, 1, 30. | ši, 14. |
| giš, 35. | me-e, 19, 30. | ŠID, 36. |
| gu=KA, 30. | me-en, 1. | šu='power', 1, 17. |
| gu=KU, 9. | MU, 16. | šu='host', 15. |
| gu-di, 30. | mu=SAR, 21. | ŠU-BU, 15. |
| gur-ru, 13, 30. | mu-ub, 29. | šu-gid, 15. |
| xirim, 26. | mulu, 3. | ŠU-KAL, 1. |
| xul, 9, 20. | mulla, 19. | -ta, 22. |
| ib=TUM, 14. | naǵ, 23. | ta, 1. |
| i-de, 14. | nen-tuk, 36. | ta-a-an, 1. |
| igi, 14. | NI, 34. | tab-ru, 13. |
| im, 11. | nú, 33, 34. | tar, 18. |
| immeli, 23. | nu-banda, 33. | te, 1, 12, 30. |
| in-, 36. | nu-gíssar, 33. | te-ba, 1, 12. |
| IS, 10. | nu-uš, 36. | te-ba-zi-gi-en, 12. |
| iši, 10. | nu-zu, 16. | tega, 12. |
| KA, 9, 19. | papsukal, 1. | te-lù(LAL), 19, 20. |
| kankal, 26. | PAP-PAP, 17. | ti-li, 10. |
| ki, 13, 27. | ra=DU, 29. | tub-ba, 11. |
| ki-, 11. | -ra, 16. | tug=KU, 31. |
| kib, 28. | rab, 12. | tuk, 15. |
| kib-kib-ki, 28. | ri, 26, 27. | TUK, 25. |
| KI-KAL, 26. | ri-nr-ku, 27. | TUM=ib, 14. |
| KI-E-NE-DI, 18. | rub, 12. | tum=KU, 31. |
| KU, 11, 20, 25. | ru-ru, 10. | tup-pa, 11. |
| ku=rubá, 27. | sa, 10. | TUR-DA=banda, 30. |
| ku=ašábu, 24, 25. | sag, 16, 20. | udu-šu, 22. |
| ku=labášu, 31. | sal, 9. | u-kib, 28. |

| | | |
|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| <i>ur</i> , 27. | <i>za-e</i> , 12. | <i>zi-dū</i> , 14, 34. |
| <i>ur</i> , 16. | <i>zag</i> , 20. | <i>zič-da</i> , 4, 25. |
| <i>ur-mu-sag</i> , 16. | <i>zal-la=NI</i> , 34. | <i>-zu</i> =‘thy’, 14. |
| <i>ur-sag</i> , 16. | <i>zi</i> , 12, 25. | <i>su=niméqi</i> , 36. |
| <i>ur-sig</i> , 16. | <i>zib</i> , 14. | <i>zu-ni-eš</i> , 36. |
| <i>Uruk</i> , 9. | | |

GLOSSARY OF ASSYRIAN WORDS.

| | | |
|--------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|
| <i>aballut</i> , 10. | <i>duppu</i> , 35. | <i>niméqi</i> , 36. |
| <i>abáru</i> , 1. | <i>xamdmu</i> , 27. | <i>nugyatu</i> , 14. |
| <i>abu</i> , 29. | <i>fixá</i> , 12. | <i>sakápu</i> , 13, 30. |
| <i>aláku</i> , 20. | <i>zíq šári</i> , 26. | <i>paxáru ša išáti</i> , 33. |
| <i>alálu</i> , 18. | <i>kabtu</i> , 15. | <i>parásu</i> , 10. |
| <i>acá</i> , 21. | <i>kénu</i> , 14. | <i>pá</i> , 19, 30. |
| <i>ašábu</i> , 20, 25. | <i>kiššutu</i> , 15. | <i>çalálu</i> , 11. |
| <i>ašáridu</i> , 20, 33. | <i>kunnú</i> , 9. | <i>cubátu</i> , 11. |
| <i>énu</i> , 14. | <i>labášu</i> , 31. | <i>gálu káru</i> , 38. |
| <i>eprá</i> , 10. | <i>labíru</i> , 3. | <i>gáltu</i> , 19, 30. |
| <i>idlu</i> , 35. | <i>lamá</i> , 35. | <i>rubá</i> , 27, 35. |
| <i>ikdu</i> , 30. | <i>lapputtá</i> , 33. | <i>ša</i> , 3, 13. |
| <i>ilu</i> , 35. | <i>limnu</i> , 15, 20. | <i>šalummatu</i> , 13. |
| <i>iqqar</i> , 10. | <i>limuttu</i> , 9. | <i>šammu</i> , 28. |
| <i>ircitu</i> , 27. | <i>lišánu</i> , 19. | <i>šaná</i> , 11. |
| <i>išá</i> , 15, 36. | <i>lubuštu</i> , 11. | <i>šétu</i> , 10, |
| <i>išátu</i> , 35. | <i>luman</i> , 36. | <i>šimtan</i> , 14. |
| <i>uggatu</i> , 14. | <i>malá</i> , 20. | <i>šimtu</i> , 14. |
| <i>bašá</i> , 1, 36. | <i>melultu</i> , 18. | <i>šumu</i> , 16. |
| <i>bikátu</i> , 31. | <i>menartu</i> , 18. | <i>šurbá</i> , 17. |
| <i>gallá</i> , 19. | <i>míná</i> , 1, 12. | <i>taknítu</i> , 9. |
| <i>dámu</i> , 15. | <i>mírsu</i> , 28. | <i>táru</i> , 16. |
| <i>dannu</i> , 1. | <i>nadá</i> , 11. | <i>tašíxtu</i> , 32. |
| <i>dimtu</i> , 31. | <i>nalbašu</i> , 11. | <i>terigtu</i> , 26. |
| <i>dinu</i> , 18, 29. | <i>nakásu</i> , 18. | |
| <i>duxudu</i> , 28. | <i>namáru</i> , 34. | |

Some Persian References to Zoroaster and his Religion.—By
Dr. ABRAHAM YOHANNAN and Professor A. V. WILLIAMS
JACKSON, of Columbia University, New York City.

SINCE the appearance of Jackson's *Zoroaster the Prophet*, in 1899, some additional material for Muhammadan sources has been published or become accessible so as to supplement the material collected in Appendix VI, pp. 280-286 of that volume. See, for example, the addenda in Gray's review, *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 4. 361-362; Stackelberg, *Bemerkungen zur Persischen Sagegeschichte*, in WZKM. 12. 231-234 (Der Berg Sabalan); and Jackson, "Some Additional Data on Zoroaster," in *Orientalische Studien Theodor Nöldeke gewidmet*, pp. 1031-1038. Several Persian selections also from the interesting texts edited by Salemann, "Mélanges Asiatiques," in the *Bulletin de L'Académie Impériale des Sciences de St. Petersbourg* 9. 417-594, will be found translated by Yohannan in the forthcoming Spiegel Memorial Volume, to be published by the Parsi Panchayat in Bombay.

The purpose of the present paper is to make accessible in English, with illustrative notes, another selection from the Persian texts edited by Salemann in the work already referred to.

This Persian treatise, entitled *Siwar-i Akālim-i Sab'ah*, or "Sketches of Seven Countries," was written about A.D. 1400, (see Salemann, *Mél. Asiat.*, p. 493, and cf. Jackson, *Persia Past and Present*, p. 53), and contains a legend which ascribes the heavy snows in winter around Ardabil and Mount Savalān to the working of a curse uttered long ago by Zoroaster, whose prophetic mission and teaching are described. The author mentions in succession the regions of Āz̄arbāijān, Armenia, Kurdistān, Western Rūm (i. e. Turkey) and Mughān in Māzandarān, and speaks of Āz̄arbāijān as Zoroaster's native place, describing, moreover, his wanderings from that province to Khorāsān and Balkh, where his teachings were ultimately accepted. For the text see Salemann (*Mél. Asiat.*, pp. 496-501); the translation is as follows:

"Zarādusht the Sage (حکیم *Hakīm*) was from Āzarbāijān. He acquired the sciences (علوم 'ulūm) in Antioch of Rūm, and knew astronomy well (علم فلك 'ilm -i nūjūm), and he was for some time in attendance (ملازم *mālāzim*) upon Jonas the Prophet, may peace be upon him.¹ When Zarādusht beheld the manner (lit. order) of prophecy and the guidance of the people by Jonas, he was pleased with it, and an aspiration to be a prophet arose in him. He returned then and came back to Āzarbāijān and lived for fifteen years on Mount Sabalān,² a very famous mountain, and compiled the *Zand u Pāzand* and entered upon his mission (lit. began his calling).

"At first he came to Ardabil and extended his invitation to the people there, but they did not accept it, and he called down a malediction upon them and spake: 'May God send disaster (بلايا *balā*) upon your town so that ye all perish!' Then he departed thence. And some days afterwards it began to snow and be cold. The snow continued for three days and nights without cessation, so that the houses were full of snow, and all the people perished from the cold."³

"From Ardabil he turned his face towards Khorāsān, but found that it was not a favourable place for him to expound his doctrine. He went later as far as Balkh, and there they accepted his call.⁴ The king in those days was Lohrasp,⁵ and into Lohrasp's presence he came, and invited him to the faith. And some say that he (Zoroaster) came down فرود آمد (*farūd*)

¹ This reference to Jonas is worth noting; we have allusions elsewhere to Zoroaster's having been the disciple of Jeremiah or even of Ezra; see Jackson, *Zoroaster*, pp. 30, 38.

² Written سبلان Sayalān in the text. We have allusions elsewhere to Sabalān, Savalān, or Sayalān as a holy mountain in connection with Zoroastrianism; see Jackson, *Zoroaster*, p. 195, and *Persia Past and Present*, pp. 58, 54, 61, and Stackelberg, WZKM. 12. 281-284.

³ On the extreme cold in the region of Ardabil and Savalān, see Jackson, *Persia Past and Present*, pp. 58-54.

⁴ The rôle played by Balkh in connection with Zoroaster's ministry is discussed in Jackson, *Zoroaster*, pp. 60, 208-219.

⁵ Ordinarily the following section of the story is told by other writers, not of Lohrasp but of his son Vishtasp, who was Zoroaster's patron. See more correctly, Jackson, *Zoroaster*, pp. 62-64.

āmad) from the front of Lohrasp's roof,' and Lohrasp said, 'Who art thou?' He replied, 'I am a prophet, and am come from the presence of God in order to invite you to God.' Lohrasp demanded some miracles from him, and one of them was this: He had a matchless horse, and both its fore legs and hind legs had gone into its body, and the horse was cramped and fell down. (Lohrasp) said, 'Make the horse well.' He (Zardūsh) made signs four times over (lit. towards) the horse.¹ The horse became well and got up, and Lohrasp accepted the religion of Zardūsh and promulgated it (lit. gave it fame), and Gushtasp² and Isfandiār and Bahmān, all gave their sanction to the religion of Zardūsh. And the country of Iran and a part of Turān and Hindustān and Arabia accepted his religion.³

"He then presented (to them) the Zand ū Pāzand, and enjoined upon them five things as obligatory: husbandry, benevolence, truthfulness, harmlessness, loyalty to the king (خسرو پرستی *Khusrau parasti*).⁴ He enjoined upon them to pray three times a day, at sunrise, noonday, and sunset, making the sun their قبلا (kiblah). He taught them a few words, saying, 'Ye shall recite these words,' and the words are the following:⁵ And they said, 'How is it that these

¹ The entrance from the roof or through the roof is alluded to by Kazwīnī and Ibn al-Athīr; see Gottheil, *References to Zoroaster*, p. 40.

² This story of the horse is as old as the Zartūsh Nāmah, and is several times retold; see Jackson, *Zoroaster*, p. 62-64, and Rosenberg, *Le Livre de Zoroaster*, p. 55.

³ The Persian text here has Gurshasp.

⁴ The text has simply the names Iran and part of Turk, Hind and Arab.

⁵ The first three virtues are frequently alluded to in the Avesta, and the latter two are implied in certain passages of the Zoroastrian scriptures.

⁶ The Persian text gives, with variants, the words: *ašam vahū vahaš-tam astu / asnā hamāi(nam) / yad šāyam yašam* and *yatā faryū fartā farāftār ātaš at fajā fanjī fanjak vazdā hanzū babudat vāstārān*. It is manifest that these unintelligible lines are a corruption of the two most sacred formulas of Zoroastrianism, the *Ashem Vohu* and the *Yathā Ahū Vairyō*. In Avestan the *Ashem Vohu* formula is as follows:

*ašəm vohū vahištəm astī
uštā astī uštā ohmāi
hyat ašāi vahištəm ašəm.*

words (lit. this word) do not resemble the words of man (lit. of anybody)?' He replied: 'As God does not resemble man, so likewise his words do not resemble the words of man.'

"And he pronounced the . . . man,¹ and every Magian woman that is menstruous² حایض (*hayiz*) unclean; whatever she wears and whatever she puts her hand upon, they shall throw into the desert.³ And they place the dead in the open air in order that each one of the elements may go to its center (i. e. original source). And the Dakhmah in which they put the dead they must strew with small pieces of iron,⁴ and in each case they ought to make a small Dakhmah on the side of that, so that no grass may grow.⁵ And if grass still appear in the Dakhmah, they must abandon the Dakhmah and transfer it elsewhere, and they say (the reason for this is) that the earth declines it;⁶ therefore they should not put the dead on the ground, because the earth will be defiled, they say, and any product that comes out of the earth will be defiled. Moreover, they should not eat

The first line of this is represented fairly well in the Persian, but the introductory Avestan words *ušč asti* of the second line have nothing to represent them in the Persian jargon, although *astā hamāi(nam)*—the former being miswritten as *asnā*, for *astā*—crudely represents Av. *ušč ahmāi* of the original prayer. In the third line we can just recognize a remnant of the Avestan *hyat ašāi vahīštōm ašem* in the obscure Persian combination *yad [a]šāi(am) (y)ašam*.

The representation of the *Yathā Ahū Vairyō* formula is even less clear although we can see in a general sort of way how the garbled Persian *yatā faryū fartā frarāftār ātā* should echo in an imperfect manner the original Avestan *yaθā ahū rairyō aθā ratuš*, with a faint reminiscence of Av. *ašāt ciθ hacā vayhanā* in the Persian corruption at *fajā fanjī*. The errors here, as above, are due partly to mistakes in hearing and partly to inaccuracies or blunders in the manuscript transmission.

¹ Some attribute for the man evidently omitted here.

² In translating this entire sentence literally the English style has been sacrificed to the Persian idiom.

³ The import of this injunction is in accordance with the letter and the spirit of the Avesta.

⁴ The import of this usage is in harmony with Vd. 6. 46.

⁵ This passage is not absolutely clear, but it seems to imply that a structure (perhaps another wall) shall be built around it to prevent forever the grass from encroaching nearer.

⁶ Compare the personification of the earth and Spenta Armaiti in the Avesta, e.g. Vd. 3. 7-35.

bread nor drink wine out of a vessel that is made of clay (of the place).¹

"And since, according to the religion of Zardusht, harmlessness is an obligation, they slaughter no animal; but (lit. and) they do eat of what has been slaughtered (by any one) who is not of their own religion.

"The Magi say that Zardusht was Abraham Khalil, and this fire that we are burning is the same fire that did not burn Abraham.² But they speak lies, for Zardusht Hakim is not Abraham Khalil.

"And again the Magi say that God and Iblis are two brothers. A thousand years of the world are a cycle of God, and a thousand years a cycle of Iblis.³ But Zardusht did not make such a statement because it is far from wisdom. Furthermore, Zardusht has said that there is a heaven and a hell and a resurrection (*حشر Hašr*) an assembling (*نخش ناشر Našr*) and a retribution and a punishment, also Ahriman and Sarush.⁴ And (he said) 'Sarush comes' to me from the presence of God and brings me orders from God, and ye must not be deceived by Ahriman, but be engaged in goodness.'⁵ For that reason Zardusht can not have said this word (N.B. made such a statement as above, about God and Iblis being two brothers).

"At the beginning of the Khalāfat of the dynasty of Abbās, they saw a person on a high dome in Khorasan, to which there was no approach nor a ladder.⁶ The people marvelled as to how he got up on that dome. They asked him, 'Who art thou?' He replied, 'Bahzid the Magian, and I have come from the presence of God in order to call men to the religion of

¹ The idea of this extreme injunction is to avoid any possibility of defilement through contact with matter that is *nasu*, according to the Avesta.

² Shall we refer to Genesis 15, 17?

³ We have here an allusion, even if incomplete, to the well-known millennial doctrine in Zoroastrianism.

⁴ All these are well-known Zoroastrian doctrines. For the belief in the 'resurrection' (Phl. *rīstāzēz*), and the assembly, see Bundaheshn 30. 1-33, and compare the references in Jackson, *Die iranische Religion*, in *Grdr. Iran. Philol.* 2, 686.

⁵ The original Persian has the plural here.

⁶ Cf. Vsp. 15. 1-8.

⁷ This story seems not to have been recorded elsewhere.

Zardusht.' They brought him down from there. In a short time three thousand men gathered about him (i. e., followed him). The Abū Muslim of Marv collected an army and came and killed Bahzād the Magian."

The selections given above certainly have an interest for the student of Zoroastrianism because they preserve old traditions which were current at least six centuries ago, and they date back, no doubt, to a period of great antiquity, because many of the statements contained in the Persian text have parallels or analogues either in the Pahlavi writings or in the Avestan texts themselves.

Mohammed 'Abdu, late Mufti of Egypt.—By RICHARD GOTTHEIL, Professor in Columbia University, New York.

THERE are few periods in its history during which the Mohammedan world has been so evidently in default of powerful and leading minds as at the present day. In Europe and in Africa, in Asia and in Polynesia—to whichever corner of Mohammedan statehood or civilization one turns—one looks in vain for the master minds in statecraft, in philosophy, in jurisprudence or in literature, that graced as well as guided the civilization of former times. The tide of spiritual witness to the faith has perhaps never ebbed so far away from its source. The products of real learning were probably never so rare; the Arab muse never so silent. In Turkey, it is true, the reins of government are held too tightly to permit the free development of the mind; in Morocco they are held too lightly, so that anarchy and political turmoil consume the vital forces of its people. Even India seems to have lost the infectious inspiration spread abroad by such men as Sprenger, Lees and Howell. Persia and Mesopotamia remain desert and unproductive. In Egypt—the greater home of the faith—literary activity seems to waste itself in the endless and weary drip of *sharb*, *mukhtasar*, *takmila*, *talkhis* and *dha'il*, or in the overwrought rhetoric of ephemeral imitations drawn after the manner of French drama and English penny-dreadfuls. The native presses of Bulak, Constantinople, Kazan and Fez are largely occupied in reprinting older works for the purposes of book trade speculation, or the worthless pamphlets of modern penny-a-liners. The pen has evidently passed from the hand of the Mohammedan into that of the stranger. The Catholics in Syria, the French in Algiers and Tunis, the Germans, the English and the Italians, are cultivating the history and the theology of Islam as its own votaries did in former days; while such Mohammedans as really have a message to deliver to their people are led into the mystic twaddle of a Bāb, or forced into the underground scheming and plotting of a Sanūsī.

A few men there are who loom up out of this spiritual degradation in their endeavor to keep up the traditions of more spiritual days. Such a one was Mohammed 'Abdu, Muftī al-Diyār al-Misriyya; whose untimely death last year at the age of fifty-five has cut off the hope that he would prove a bulwark against which the tide of materialistic acquiescence in the newer order of things would break some of its force. To save his memory from utter oblivion is the object of the following lines —now that he is with Allah. A choice soul, clothed in all the nobility and in all the refinement of the truest Arab, such as stories and anecdotes have painted him for us, just and equitable to all, truly and largely charitable, courteous and courtly in his bearing—the friendship of a man like Mohammed 'Abdu is a precious memory to those that have been privileged to enjoy it.¹

Born in the year 1266 A.H. (1850) in Shenera of the Gharbia Mudīriya of Egypt, he came from most humble surroundings. When he was four years of age his father, Sheikh 'Abdu, returned with him to the home of the family in Mahallat Nasr in the Behiera Mudīriya. In 1279 A.H. (1862) he was sent to Tanṭa, where in the Jāmi' al-Ahmādī he received his first instruction. The modest instruction that such a jāmi' at that day could afford does not seem to have sufficed a mind that was already actively in search of knowledge. He returned to his home, and a little later is found at Kunaisat Urin,² in the Behera, on the railway line Damanhur-Shabrakhit-Ityai. Here lived an uncle who was a Sufi and an ascetic, the darwish 'Othmān. Though he remained here only a short while, it is evident that the association with this austere man had much effect in forming the character of the young aspirant. His uncle persuaded him to read, as a daily exercise, a book by his own teacher, Mohammed al-Mudīnī al-Maghribī al-Shādhili. Because of the moral teachings contained in this work, he studied it with much care. One day he asked his uncle what object such ascetics as he had in view. The answer was, "To hold on to

¹ The materials for this short study were given me by Mohammed 'Abdu himself and by my own Sheikh, Ahmad 'Omar al-Mahmāshī, a favorite pupil of the Mufti. A short account will also be found in the *كتب الجوهر في تاريخ الأزهر* of Sulaimān Raṣad al-Ḥanafī, Cairo, 1890 A.H., pp. 164, et seq.

² See the *Egyptian Postal Guide* for 1904, p. 162. Baedeker, *Égypte*, 1908, p. 25, "Konaïssé."

the Koran and to the Sunna." "And are not all Moslems like this?" asked Mohammed. "No," he answered, "the Koran forbids lying, and most of them lie in one way or another." "How then can I become like you?" was the next question. Whereupon he was advised to practice the *dhikr* and to read carefully the Koran. I do not know whether the young aspirant followed the advice thus given. He returned to Tanta, and in 1282 he went to Cairo to study in the Azhar Mosque. The formal instruction given there was still unsatisfactory; and after an attempt lasting three years he put himself in charge of a certain Husna al-Tawil for the study of rhetoric. When Jamāl al-Dīn al-Afghānī came to Cairo in 1288 (1871), Mohammed 'Abdu was quick to change to this more competent master, and studied under his direction the most various objects, grammar, prosody, philosophy, Sufism, medicine, physiology, and the science of traditions. It is idle to speculate upon the worth of so polygamous a teacher.¹

While still a student at the Azhar he commenced to show a certain independence of judgment; an independence which was quite characteristic, and which at a later time caused him no little suffering. Some of his fellow students accused him to the Sheikh 'Alīsh Bāna, on the plea that he was secretly a follower of the Mu'tazilite heresy. It is a far-off cry, almost from the Middle Ages, this dispute in regard to the eternity of the Koran, the attributes of the Godhead, and the doctrine of predestination. The Middle Ages die hard in the Orient, and Mohammed 'Abdu was forced to clear himself. Though he confessed that he had forsaken the orthodox doctrines of al-Ash'arī, he denied having joined the Mu'tazilites. He declared himself to be a simple searcher after the truth, which was, of course, begging the question. In a more positive manner he was asked whether he understood and whether he taught the 'Akā'id of al-Nasafī, the pillar of the creed of the Sunnites, a favorite text-book of orthodox Mohammedanism.² He

¹ According to Mohammedan ideas, a teacher is indispensable. This is crystallized in the saying شیخ لَا فالشیطان. See Snouck-Hurgronje in ZDMG., vol. liii, p. 145.

² Najm al-Dīn Abū Hafs 'Omar ibn Muḥammad al-Naṣaffī, died 1142 (Brockelmann, *Geschichte der Arabischen Literatur*, vol. i, p. 427), was one of the most important Ḥanifite teachers. The "'Akā'id" was rendered into English by W. Cureton, London, 1848.

seems to have completely cleared himself by his answer, and by his practice in regard to this work, so that in 1294 A.H. (1877) he received his first and his second diplomas as a teacher in the Azhar.

But he was marked out for some more important service. Riād Pasha, who had been Minister of Foreign Affairs in 1878 while the Public Debt Commission was sitting at Cairo, offered him the position of editor of the *al-Wāki‘ al-Misriyya*,¹ the *gazette officiel* that had been founded in 1832 by Mohammed Ali, and which is still published as the organ of the government. His excellent style and the boldness of his pen made the daily articles that he wrote, in a portion of the paper especially set off to this purpose, eager reading for the younger Egyptians. He did not scruple to severely criticise the government—an offence doubly heinous in an official journal. As a consequence, after a short time, he was compelled to transfer his duties on that paper to some one else. The troublous times of the dual financial control, of the rebellion of ‘Arabi, of the bombardment of Alexandria and of the British occupation, quickly followed one upon the other. No one who has at all examined into the question upon the spot, can have a momentary doubt of the great service that the Anglo-Saxons since 1882 have rendered to the old empire of the Pharaohs. The years of plenty are there, as they always will be in that country under such a courageous and benign administration as is that of the present English Consul General. Law and order make the dingiest mud-alleys of Cairo more safe than are the palace-lined streets of New York. “Al-Lurd Cromer” (as he is called) is feared; but he is implicitly obeyed. Education is moving apace; by simple attrition wearing down prejudices that centuries of practice have consolidated; and the freedom from interference in religious and social practices, which is the brightest signature of British rule over all its subjects, contributes to render the populace happy and contented. Such a general estimate as this, which can be confirmed on many sides, need not blind us to the few defects of the reconstruction period. The years of plenty may as easily be followed by lean ones; and the mad rush of the

¹ “The Events of Egypt”; see Hartmann, *The Arabic Press of Egypt*, pp. 2, 61.

speculative land-grabber and land-jobber is bound to concentrate enormous territories in the hands of a few rich European and native proprietors and to oust the fellah from his small peasant holdings. It seems a pity that with their hands entirely free, the English have not seen their way to forestall the natural results of such a sinister business as unlimited speculation.¹

To the Egyptian, however, or let me say rather to the Mohammedan in Egypt at that time, the question must have appeared in a very different light. The country was upon the verge of financial ruin. Half the construction cost of the Suez Canal, i. e. more than £9,000,000, had been successfully squeezed out of Ismā'il by Ferdinand de Lesseps; and a debt of some £72,000,000 (\$102,187,000) in 1903 had been fastened upon the country.² No amount of British success in Egypt and for Egypt can wipe off the stain which has been left by the successive French and English steps taken to secure that success. And in 1882 success was more than problematical. The Egyptian Mohammedan was exposed upon the horns of a painful dilemma—either servitude or revolt. It is no wonder then that dissatisfaction soon gave way to disaffection. Whether 'Arabi Pasha was right or wrong, his attitude naturally claimed the attention of all Egyptians who had enough manliness left to be shocked at the showy magnificence of Ismā'il, and at the straits to which his extravagance, aided by Paris and London usurers, had brought the common people. His actions, in some measure at least, voiced the feelings of many of his compatriots. Among these was Mohammed 'Abdu.³

¹ See "Land Boom in Egypt," *London Daily Telegraph*, June 18, 21, 1906.

² On the spoliation of Egypt in the interest of the bondholders in Europe see the instructive extracts from the British Blue Books in Keay, *Spoiling the Egyptians*, N. Y. 1882.

³ "In the East nationality is a matter of creed, not of race," Dicey, *The Story of the Khedeviate*, p. 218. Westerners are liable to mistake the import of events in eastern countries. The attack made upon some English officers at Denshawai on June 13th, 1906 (see the White Paper, "Correspondence respecting the Attack on British Officers at Denshawai," Egypt, No. 8, 1906), is no more evidence of a patriotic uprising than is the dispute in regard to the delimitation of the frontier in the Sinai Peninsula, which commenced toward the end of 1905. This latter undoubtedly had its origin in Constantinople, and is now in process of happy settlement. (See the White Paper: "Correspondence respecting

Mohammed 'Abdu was a fervent patriot, but not in the sense in which we understand and so often misunderstand that term. In fact, patriotism for a certain and a particular land is a virtue practically unknown to the Moslem. Even the cry of "Arabia for the Arabians," which so clearly marked the policy of the greatest statesman in Islam, the second Caliph 'Omar Ibn al-Khattāb, had a very different significance. Indeed, the cry should be rendered "Arabia for the Moslems!"; for it was a real or fancied religious need that impelled 'Omar to take the course he did. All through Moslem history, we find no trace of secular patriotism, unless we call by that name the pride of race and of family. In fact, there is no word in the Arabic dictionary to connote the idea of patriotism; the modern expression, "*hibb al-waqān*," being only a modern rendering for a European idea. The cry that was raised in Egypt during the eighties of the last century was thus in many respects a purely factious one, especially where even race pride has been swamped in the mingling of families as it has been in Egypt. To a select few, however, it embodies the thought of the spoiling of Egypt and of the degradation of the faith. To such a select few it was therefore a cry of truth, and to that select few belonged Mohammed 'Abdu.

What his share in the so-called rebellion was I have been unable to ascertain; but with many others, in the year 1882, he was exiled for mutiny. He went directly to Beirut, where he married a daughter of Sheikh Hamāda, cementing again the many bonds that have always bound Syria to Egypt. There he remained for ten years, one or two of which he spent in Hadath near Beirut, receiving his pardon only in the year 1892. Egypt was sorely in need of men educated as was Mohammed 'Abdu, and the Khedive Tawfīk was not slow to recognize his merits. He was first appointed judge of the lower court at Benha, then at Zagāzig. From there he was transferred to

the Turco-Egyptian Frontier in the Sinai Peninsula," Egypt, No. 2, 1906). The same may be said of the agitation for an Egyptian Parliament, upon the lines laid down in Lord Dufferin's project of 1882, lately inaugurated by two such hot-headed newspapers as *al-Muawwad* and *al-Liwa*. In this connection, it is worth while to read the sane and informing comments of Lord Cromer in the White Paper, No. 2, mentioned above, pp. 32, et seq.

Cairo, and to a judgeship in a native court of appeal.¹ His appointment was confirmed by Tawfik's successor, 'Abbās II Hilmi. In the year 1894 a complete organization was effected in the control and management of the teaching of the Azhar Mosque. A governing board was formed with the Grand Muftī Sheikh Hasnūn al-Nawāwī as president and al-Anbābī as vice-president. Mohammed 'Abdu was made a member of this governing board. Upon the death of al-Nawāwī in 1899, Mohammed 'Abdu was appointed Grand Muftī of Egypt; to which office also the surveillance over the Riwāk al-Hanafi belonged. At first he taught theology, rhetoric and eloquence; but he soon discontinued these subjects, confining himself to a daily lecture on the exposition of the Koran in the beautiful lecture-hall provided by the present Khedive. These lectures became so celebrated that they were published in the Cairo daily paper, al-Manār.

The authority of Mohammed 'Abdu as muftī was now supreme in Cairo; but his most potent influence was exercised in the Azhar itself. The power nominally rested with the Grand Sheikh of that famous school, al-Sayyid al-Biblāwī, and with his successor, 'Abd al-Rahmān al-Sharbīnī; but Mohammed 'Abdu was the head and leading spirit. His position there was a difficult one. At first he was in the good graces of 'Abbās II, and the two set about introducing reforms of various kinds, tending to modernize in some degree the life of the students and the instruction given. But the Khedive soon became discouraged with the opposition that his efforts encountered; and, as he himself told me, gave up the attempt in disgust. On his side, Mohammed 'Abdu became discouraged with the Khedive, because the latter's conduct in many things was in direct contravention of Moslem tradition, and because his speculations and his trading proclivities had lowered him from the high estate of a ruler to that of a merchant. Mohammed 'Abdu had travelled much in Europe. He had caught some little of the modern spirit, and he desired to infuse some of that modern spirit into the great Mohammedan university. We cannot now tell what amount of success might have crowned his efforts; but I know

no one who will be able at this juncture to fill the place that he has occupied.

It was while Mohammed 'Abdu was judge of the Court of Appeal that I first met him. In the year 1894 he had come to Switzerland to take the waters at Evian les Bains. He was then ignorant of any language other than Arabic. In February, 1905, I called upon the Grand Mufti in the Azhar to pay him my respects. As he came and sat beside me on the diwan, he said, in the most perfect French, "Some nine years ago I met in Switzerland a professor from New York"; until which moment I never suspected that the head of the faith in Egypt was the judge whom I had met in a strange land. During the years that had intervened he had returned a number of times to France; he had learned French better than I had supposed any pure Mohammedan in Egypt could learn. His speech was faultless in its grammar, and almost Parisian in its intonation. But far and beyond this, he had penetrated back of the mere outward signs of modern civilization. The European culture with which the modern Egyptian of Alexandria and Cairo vaunts himself is too often of the thinnest veneer—made up of the latest Parisian slang, the most extravagant boulevard costumes, and the sins of Paris *qui s'amuse*. At best he has read Guy de Maupassant, Catulle Mendes, and a good deal of the pornographic literature of which even many true Frenchmen are themselves ashamed. Mohammed 'Abdu had led a serious life, and he set himself to study seriously the development of thought in modern Europe. He had read Molière and Victor Hugo, Schiller and Goethe, Kant and Schopenhauer: and it was in the sacred halls of Dār al-'Ulūm, this stronghold of Mohammedan orthodoxy, that we sat in converse upon the newer life that had come to him.

Unfortunately, nothing remains of the written work of Mohammed 'Abdu that was produced in this last period of his life. The few works that he has published—partly in Cairo and partly in Beirut—are in no sense a proper witness to the full development of his mind. Perhaps the most important are his *Al-Tauhid*,¹ a work full of the best religious and moral thought,

¹رسالة في التوحيد.

and his commentary upon a few of the Suras of the Koran.¹ This latter work, written for use in government schools, though following such canonical authorities as Zamakhsharī, Baidāwī and Tabarī, and though thoroughly Mohammedan in form and tone, is yet free from the many grammatical and theological conceits and the immoderate twists that disfigure and distort the usual productions of the *tafsīr*. A modern spirit breathes through his comments, a more modern and truly religious atmosphere seems to surround them. His lectures on the Opening Sura of the Koran have lately been published by Mohammed Rashīd Ridā, editor of *al-Manār*, together with five articles written for that paper and treating of questions dealing with the Koran.² I might then mention also his commentary on the *makāmas* of Badi' al-Zamān al-Hamadānī,³ the first Arabic writer to use that form of speech which was made so famous by al-Harīrī; further, his commentary on the *Nahj al-Balāgha* of al-Murtadā,⁴ containing the supposed ethical sentences of 'Alī, a polemical work *Kitāb al-Islāmu'l-Naṣrāniya*, *Risāla fi al-Rudd 'alā al-Mosieū Hanotau*. A larger work upon the history of Arabic traditions dealing with Egypt is still unfinished.⁵

* Mohammed 'Abdu died in Ramla on July the 13th, 1905, and the universal esteem in which he was held was seen in the imposing ceremonial with which he was laid to his last rest.

¹ تفسير القرآن الكريم . published in the Government printing office, 1882 A.H.

تفسير الفاتحة ومشاكلات القرآن مبدوء بـمقدمة التفسير²
مكتب من دروس الاستاذ . . . محمد عبدة بقلم السيد محمد
رشيد رضا منشى مجلـة المنار الإسلامي .

³ شرح على مقامات بدیع الزمان³ (Brockelmann, *loc. cit.*, vol. i, p. 98), published Beirut, 1889.

⁴ شرح نهج البلاغة⁴ (Brockelmann, *loc. cit.*, vol. i, p. 404).

⁵ Mohammed 'Abdu read the proof-sheets of vol. iii of Ibn Sa'd's Biographies, and contributed a number of excellent suggestions and readings. See Eduard Sachau, *Ibn Sa'd*, vol. iii, p. xlvi.

✓

"A book that is shut is but a block"

CENTRAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL LIBRARY
GOVT. OF INDIA
Department of Archaeology
NEW DELHI.

Please help us to keep the book
clean and moving.

B. B., 146, N. DELHI.